```
1
                    IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                         SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
                              HOUSTON DIVISION
 3
 4
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
                                         ) CRIMINAL ACTION NO.
     VS.
 5
                                         ) 4:22-CR-612
     EDWARD CONSTANTINESCU
 6
                                         ) 10:42 A.M.
 7
 8
                               MOTION HEARING
                    BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANDREW S. HANEN
 9
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
                              SEPTEMBER 7, 2023
10
     APPEARANCES:
11
     FOR PLAINTIFF:
12
     MR. SCOTT PHILIP ARMSTRONG
     MR. JOHN J. LIOLOS
     United States Department of Justice
13
     1400 New York Avenue NW
14
     Washington, DC 20005
     (202)353-0801
15
     MR. THOMAS HEYWARD CARTER
16
     United States Attorney's Office
     1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300
17
     Houston, Texas 77002
      (713)567-9000
18
     FOR DEFENDANT CONSTANTINESCU:
19
     MR. MATTHEW AARON FORD
     MR. STEPHEN ROBERT HALPIN, III
20
     Ford O'Brien Landy, LLP
     3700 Ranch Road 620 South, Suite B
21
     Austin, Texas 78738
      (512)503-6388
22
     MS. JAMIE HOXIE SOLANO
23
     Ford O'Brien Landy LLP
     275 Madison Avenue, Floor 24
24
     New York, New York 10016
      (212)858-0040
25
```

```
1
     APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
 2
     FOR DEFENDANT MATLOCK:
     MR. LUIS ALEJANDRO REYES
 3
     Ashcroft Law Firm
     919 Congress Avenue, Suite 1500
 4
     Austin, Texas 78701
      (512)370-1800
 5
     MR. WILLIAM M. STRADLEY
 6
     Stradley Law Firm
     1545 Heights Boulevard, Suite 200
 7
     Houston, Texas 77008
      (713)725-8743
 8
     FOR DEFENDANT RYBARCZYK:
 9
     MR. PHILIP HARLAN HILDER
     MR. QUENTIN TATE WILLIAMS
10
     MS. STEPHANIE K. MCGUIRE
     Hilder & Associates, P.C.
     819 Lovett Boulevard
11
     Houston, Texas 77006
12
     (713)655-9111
13
    MR. ERIC SAMUEL ROSEN
     Dynamis LLP
14
     225 Franklin Street, 26th Floor
     Boston, Massachusetts 02110
15
     (617)802 - 9157
16
     FOR DEFENDANT DEEL:
     MR. NEAL ANDREW DAVIS
17
     Neal Davis Law Firm
     1545 Heights Boulevard, Suite 700
18
     Houston, Texas 77008
     (713)227-4444
19
     MR. ZACHARY BROWN FERTITTA
20
     Fertitta Law Firm
     902 Heights Boulevard
21
     Houston, Texas 77008
      (832)723-9900
22
     FOR DEFENDANT HRVATIN:
23
     MR. EDWARD MALLETT
     Mallett Saper, L.L.P.
24
     5300 Memorial Drive, Suite 750
     Houston, Texas 77007
25
     (713)236-1900
```

```
1
     APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
 2
     FOR DEFENDANT COOPERMAN:
     MR. CHIP BRANDON LEWIS
 3
     Attorney at Law
     1207 South Shepherd Drive
 4
     Houston, Texas 77019
      (713)523-7878
 5
     MR. SINA M. ZADEH
 6
     Sina Zadeh Law Firm
     1001 McKinney Street, Suite 803
 7
     Houston, Texas 77002
      (832)545 - 9790
 8
     FOR DEFENDANT HENNESSEY:
 9
     MS. LAURA MARIE KIDD CORDOVA
     Jackson Walker LLP
10
     1401 McKinney Street, Suite 1900
     Houston, Texas 77010
     (713)752-4449
11
12
     MR. MICHAEL JAMES MURTHA
     Jackson Walker, LLP
     2323 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
13
     Dallas, Texas 75201
     (214)953-6187
14
15
     COURT REPORTER:
     Heather Alcaraz, CSR, FCRR, RMR
16
     Official Court Reporter
     515 Rusk, Suite 8004
17
     Houston, Texas 77002
      (713)250-5584
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
     Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
     produced by computer.
25
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

21

22

24

25

10:43:3510

10:44:0616

10:44:1818

10:44:2420

10:44:3323

10:42:14

10:42:56

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: All right. Be seated. Let me unpack a little bit here.

All right. Counsel, we have a lot of things I want to kind of cover today, but I've -- going to follow the suggestion of Mr. Williams, who filed, on behalf of Mr. Rybarczyk, a suggested order to attack things. And his -- he actually grouped them together, which I thought was nice of him to do that, that way.

But the -- I mean, let's get rid of the elephant in the room: The trial setting. And by "get rid of," I don't mean get rid of the trial setting necessarily, but I'm -- I have multiple motions for continuance. I have a motion to sever, which, in the alternative, requests a motion for continuance.

So let's start with that.

Who wants to lead off? I mean, they're primarily the defendants'. I hear the government saying they're ready to go.

MS. CORDOVA: Your Honor, I'll start. Laura Cordova on behalf of Mitchell Hennessey. We filed the motion to sever.

Mr. Hennessey has asserted his speedy trial rights. He wants to go to trial in October. This cloud of the indictment has been hanging over him since December.

The -- we're in this position where people are not ready to go to trial. His codefendants are not ready to go to trial because of the way the government has prosecuted this

case. They didn't produce the 397 episodes in the indictment -they're not in the indictment. They're not alleged in the
indictment -- and they adamantly refused to provide the core of
this case, which is the false statements, until mid-June, even
though the defendants were indicted in December.

So our position is that the remedy is not to push this

So our position is that the remedy is not to push this out and make Mr. Hennessey suffer longer under this cloud of indictment, with an ankle monitor on that beeps randomly and is a serious limitation on his freedom, but to go to trial -- to go to trial and, at the same time, when other codefendants are not ready, understandably, it would not be fair, and it would be a due process violation for Mr. Hennessey to have to proceed to trial with codefendants' counsel who are not prepared to defend. Therefore, we're seeking a severance and to maintain the October 23rd trial date.

THE COURT: Okay. I hear one vote for the October 23rd trial date.

MR. ROSEN: Judge, may I?

THE COURT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

21

23

24

25

10:45:4416

10:45:5318

10:45:5419

10:46:0520

10:46:0922

10:45:04

MR. ROSEN: Briefly, Eric Rosen on behalf of Mr. Rybarczyk.

There is a massive amount of evidence in this case -I think well over one terabyte. We sort of stopped counting
recently -- a lot of it very dense trading data that must be
analyzed by computer program. The government has put together

charts --

10:47:3518

10:46:5611

10:46:22

10:46:26

10:46:27

THE COURT: Let me stop there because I've seen this, and --

MR. ROSEN: Right.

THE COURT: -- and I've seen some of the exhibit

lists, and -- and explain to me -- and I'm not saying you're

wrong, but -- and I may be missing -- and you guys know the

facts so much better than I do. I mean, you know, in a criminal

case, I learn about the facts the same time the jury does,

basically.

But I see this -- the government's case, basically, that the defendants -- and this is their contention. This is not the Court making a finding -- the defendants got on the Internet, pumped up the stock, and then sold it while they were telling the investing public that they weren't doing that. I mean, it's basically you lied, you know. You said you were doing X; you were doing Y.

And so explain to me why -- and maybe it's because I don't understand the government's case or the extent of the government's case. Explain to me why all the trading data and all this other kind of stuff, why is that -- and, I mean, obviously, the defendants' trades are important because, I mean, I can see the government's going to say, "At 10:00 o'clock in the morning on September 23rd, you said A, B, and C, and then you turned around two hours later and did something different."

So that part I understand why you do -- but what is -
2 tell me about why you need what you think you need.

10:48:18

10:49:0817

10:49:1520

10:49:3025

10:48:4210

MR. ROSEN: Sure. Well, I think you -- you nailed it,

Judge. The -- did they say, A, B, and C? And it wasn't that

they typically said that, "We're always holding," or, "We're not

selling." My -- I would say 90 percent of these are simply

opinions about what the stock is going to do in the future.

It's not -- in order to be convicted of this crime, you have to

have an intent to defraud.

Simply saying that the stock -- "I think it's great," or, "I think it's going to go to six," in our view, is -- does not comprise an intent to defraud when you have significant movement between the time of a tweet and when -- the time of a sale. You tweet at 2:55 p.m., "I think this stock is great." You might sell off some of your position at 3:00 p.m., and the question is: Why did you make that sale?

The government's going to say that they were lying.

That's not what we're saying. We're saying most of these stocks had significant movement.

You would have had to have been a fool if you did not sell off a portion of your position. It's not inconsistent with what you said five minutes earlier to do that, and you have to take this in context of what these defendants are actually, -- who they actually are.

These are not long-term investors. It's not Charles

10:49:45

10:50:03 9

10:50:1112

10:50:2818

10:50:3621

Schwab or Goldman Sachs. These are day traders. Their literal job is to sell quantities of stock with -- with small price movements in the market to lock in trades.

If you read these books, these day trading books, it's not inconsistent at all to say -- to have a positive opinion in the stock and sell off half your position, because your price target has been reached, and you're locking in profits or you're trying to develop cash for another trade.

That's what we have to develop. That's why the minute movements in the stock prices are so critical to our case, because it defeats this intent to defraud.

I would agree with you, if the stock had no volatility and no volume, it would be less important. It would be less important if this was Microsoft, but these are not. These are stocks that day traders pick particularly because the volatility is so high, and that informs exactly what they're seeing inside their head.

It's so critical for us to really review exactly who -- you know, what's going on; who's tweeting; what's in the market.

The other thing that we're seeing, Judge, is that you have, you know, these level 2 trading platforms that have buys and sell orders. Now, when you're a trader, you look at a lot of those sell orders because you're trying to predict what the price is going to do in the future. You tweet out, "I think

this is going to 5."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

23

24

10:51:3818

10:51:3919

10:51:4120

10:51:5525

10:50:53

10:51:07

10:51:1811

Guess what? Someone throws up a big sell order.

Boom. What are you going to do? You're going to try to get out ahead of it or at least lock in some of your profits. Again, not inconsistent with what you said, you're reacting to minute changes in the market.

These are people staring at their computers all day.

These are people who go to the bathroom or go out for lunch, and they have -- they will put up sell -- automatic sell orders because they know how guickly this -- this changes.

Again, this is going to come down -- this trial's going to come down to an intent to defraud and what they wanted to do. That's why it's so important. We have 397 of these to go through. We've prepared some charts in some of them. You can see the big buy orders, and you can see the big sell orders. I'm happy to produce these to the Court. I can -- we can file them online --

THE COURT: Please don't.

MR. ROSEN: Yeah. I know. It will be a box.

But, you know, we're at task for this. We're responsible for 397 of these. I used to prosecute pump-and-dumps. One or two are typically charged in the indictment. I have never seen 397. I've never seen more than five or ten.

Every one of these is critical, and the

1 government's -- we're going to sit here at trial and play Whac-A-Mole. We defeat one pump-and-dump; they'll come back, 2 3 "Oh, here's pump-and-dump 66." How do you tackle that one? Well, let me get out my trading data, and I'll show you exactly 4 what happened second by second, minute by minute, everything 5 -- every time sequence is extraordinarily important when they're 6 7 trying to make money off very, very small intervals. So that's why it's so important, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Let me ask you, while you're standing 10:52:22 9 there and since you raised this issue: Why am I trying 397? 10 MR. ROSEN: I would completely agree. I -- you know, 10:52:3011 12 19 -- I think Mr. Williams' motion from last night was, you know, extraordinarily on point on that. We have 397. The 13 government has said in their papers, "Oh, we're only going to 14 15 focus" -- only -- "on the first 45," but then they say they reserve the right to, you know, put in any -- any of them. 16 10:52:5217 And, you know, for us that's, obviously, you know -- it would be malpractice if we said, oh, we'll just focus 18 19 on those 45 because the government said, you know, they're reserving rights, but they're not committing to anything. 20 They've committed to nothing. We're going to be here for months 21 and months unless we narrow this case down. 22

An [sic] indictment has 19. That's plenty to go -- to go to trial on. The jury will certainly get a flavor.

10:53:0923

10:53:1425

24

It's cumulative, it's prejudicial, and some of these

10:54:2225

10:53:5314

10:53:39

episodes, as we're going to point out in motions in limine, are simply false. They're -- you know, there's one my client's charged with \$2 million worth of stock fraud. The first thing that they say was just when the stock hit its peak, he's like, the stock -- you know, the stock went up 700 percent. That's the first tweet, and then it goes down. He's selling, obviously, but he had nothing to do with the pump. It's not even alleged.

And how could he -- how could he commit fraud? We have to go through each and every one. Dr. Garibotti, the government's expert, has locked herself into 397. It's our job to cross-examine her to show that, you know, her -- the flaws and what she did wrong in this.

As another example we're going to point out in our motions in limine, the government's charts have like all these sell orders to create this huge red sequence to make it look like there's this big dump. When you look at it and you actually compare against the trading records, there's usually just one or two sells, and they've expanded this -- because the price sometimes, if you sell, say, a thousand shares, there'll be a bunch of different executions, and they've expanded that to make it look like there's all these different orders coming in like they're sitting there dumping on the ground, but they're not.

And we're charged -- we have to go through that and

10:54:31

10:54:46 9

10:55:0115

10:55:1520

10:55:2824

show why it's wrong. And we're working for the motions in limine on Wednesday to point out -- but there's, like -- there's real issues with these exhibits.

You know, Mr. Hennessey's motion pointed out that the government's text messages -- I mean, it's crazy. They've spliced and diced it to make it appear that these are real text message chains when they're leaving out huge portions of the conversation.

I was just looking at one this morning. There's a one -- one thing saying where one of the defendants is purportedly defining a pump-and-dump, making it look like some type of admission, where right below that he's saying, you know, this wasn't a pump-and-dump, you know, that he wasn't selling at this time.

I mean, it's -- it's really -- these are -- with the number of -- volume of exhibits, we have to go through each and every one. We have to correct the government's exhibits. We have to fight about it. We're definitely going to file many motions about them, motions to exclude.

There's a lot of authenticity issues that other -other of my, you know, cocounsel here are going to raise
regarding Twitter timestamps. There was one person in the UK, I
think, that was controlling.

This is not a case where we can hastily rush to trial.

We need to flesh out all these issues, and my client's and every

10:56:1213

10:56:2818

10:55:38

10:55:52

other clients' Sixth Amendment right depend -- depends on that.

Twenty-four months is the average -- we just looked at this last night. Twenty-four months is the average case going to trial nationwide. This is one of the most complex cases I've ever seen, I think my colleagues have ever seen doing it.

It's been ten months in October. I think, you know, based on that, it would be squarely within the norm and, in fact, very early just to give a couple-month extension so we can raise these issues. We can tee them up. We can work with the government, meet and confer about these exhibits, to make sure we get it right or, otherwise, we're going to be facing 2255s down the road.

And the other thing is we need to know what we're facing here. They've done 397, as Your Honor points out. Say they only put in 19. Is there double jeopardy issues? I mean, are my clients [sic] going to be like, "If we win, are we going to be charged again with the 40 going down the road?"

I mean, there's a lot of issues that we need to flesh out in the indictment like this that just simply haven't been raised or do -- we don't have time to raise. We would love to do that, and we just need the time -- the few months, respectively, for everyone to get on the same page, and we'll narrow this case down so that it's reasonable and we can get out of here, you know, before the -- you know, before the -- you know, within a couple weeks as opposed to the many months' long

trial we're now facing. 1 THE COURT: Okay. 10:56:57 2 (Sotto voce discussion between the Court and case manager.) 10:57:01 3 MR. LEWIS: May I approach, Your Honor? 10:57:21 4 10:57:22 5 THE COURT: You may. MR. LEWIS: Good morning. Your Honor, I am going to 10:57:24 7 elaborate very briefly upon a point that Mr. Rosen just made relative to a huge issue that we face in pretrial preparation 8 given the government's proposed trial exhibits. 9 With the Court's permission, I brought an illustration 10:57:4310 because I don't think it's fair for this Court to try to 11 12 evaluate the incredible need for ample time to prepare this case given, as the Court said, "I don't even know about the facts 13 14 yet." With that said -- Rhonda, can I give the judge -- thank 15 you, ma'am. 10:58:0816 (Document handed to the Court.) 10:58:2117 MR. LEWIS: The government, in their disclosure of trial exhibits, included the gravamen of their case, the 18 defendants' statements, largely direct messages, tweets, 19 et cetera, and I am not here to cast aspersions. That's not 20 necessary. The facts speak for themselves. 21 If His Honor will look at the exhibit that we have 10:58:4222 compiled, I've got reams of paper of similar exhibits, but I 23 think this one will make the point for His Honor, given how 24

quick His Honor has shown to be over all the years I've known

25

him.

11:00:2122

10:59:30 9

10:59:5315

10:59:01

Mr. Rosen's statement that these pieces of evidence are taken out of context could not be made any clearer by that exhibit. As I said, not casting any aspersions on the government, but in the monumental preparation that they have already put into this case, there have been some errors made relative to even who the author of said statements are. We've identified a number of these.

I can tell you, Your Honor, as Mrs. Epley has been off in Austin embroiled in that, I have been pouring through government exhibits trying to get myself as -- up to speed. I'm last to the game in this. I was -- first appeared in this case in March after I finished a five-month death penalty trial in Lubbock.

I assure the Court -- and I know the Court knows me.

I have been working as hard as one person can to get up to speed. That process was greatly slowed when I had to go through each and every one of these statements that my client is alleged to have made in support of the conspiracy and his own substantive counts and piece together the context of what was really said.

I bring that to the Court's example [sic] to show you it's not just the volume -- and I can assure you, Your Honor, not since I represented Mr. Lay in Enron have I seen this much volume of evidence.

11:01:4419

11:01:04

11:01:1912

When I saw the statistics promulgated by our U.S. District Court's combined civil and criminal judicial facts and figures that Mr. Rosen referenced and that Mr. Williams so kindly put in his footnote of last night's pleading, I was shocked because I had my office manager, this morning, look at the 19 pending federal cases that I have, and none of them have gone to trial or been disposed within two years.

A lot of that is outside of His Honor's control, of the government's control, and of any of these defendants' control because of the backlog we all suffered from COVID and many of the attenuate delays that that has occasioned.

But to put this in that perspective, Your Honor, I have a very robust caseload, and none of my cases -- every one of my cases put together does not measure the complexity, the volume of this case. I have absolutely no hesitation looking the Court in the eye and telling Your Honor there is absolutely no way I can properly represent Mr. Cooperman beginning on October the 23rd.

And what I pledge to this Court, given my history with this Court -- I think the Court has no doubt I will come -- it will come to fruition. I will use the holidays. I will use the time down out of court around Thanksgiving and Christmas to put in 18-hour days to make sure I'm ready, but I tell the Court, without reservation -- and I can go on and on, but I don't believe in beating a dead horse. I know this Court listens

acutely to what is said.

11:03:117

11:03:1720

11:02:12

11:02:35

11:02:39 9

I simply cannot give Mr. Cooperman, a young man that's never before been in trouble in his entire life, facing arguably one of the most novel theories of prosecutions we have anywhere in American jurisprudence today -- with the current schedule. I will answer any questions for this fine Court, should the Court have any, but I wanted to point out --

THE COURT: Walk me through what you handed me.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, Your Honor. What we have here: The government's exhibit is on the right where it says, "Government Recreation." The "real" is going back to my client's own phone, pulling these same text messages, and the real time off of his phone. I used the red boxes, Your Honor, to illustrate the differences so that the Court can see this is not just taking out one or two statements within a conversation. These are multiples.

And like I said, no need to cast aspersions. They put together their exhibits the way they want to. The Court will determine if they're admissible.

My problem is the hours and hours that I had to spend with my client to put together what the texts really were, and it's indicative of why this is such a Herculean task, as I told you, and I'm not -- I'm not trying to master or wax hyperbolic, Your Honor. The fact of the matter is the government has very adroitly presented this Court that this is a simple

pump-and-dump.

11:05:1024

11:03:48

11:04:13

11:04:2211

11:04:4417

I am not a securities lawyer by nature. I am a trial lawyer. So I am learning a lot about some of the specific securities laws germane to this case, but in doing so I can tell this Court, as a trial lawyer, there is absolutely no way I can be ready, even given the pace of the work that I am on, on October the 23rd of this year.

The significance of those text messages was to show you those are the bulk of the government's trial exhibits. I think they're the first few hundred.

So as I said, I've got reams of paper of these that illustrate the amount of work that has to be done to go back and make sure what their trial exhibit is, we have a proper objection, we have authentication, and I can talk to my client intelligently about, "What were you saying before this tweet that makes it make sense?"

Because as Mr. Rosen said, you're going to be talking about not minutes, not hours, we're going to be talking about seconds in this trial when, in fact, relative to my client, we have found, relative to the five substantive counts he's indicted on, Your Honor, there are episodes wherein he has made a statement of opinion about his feeling on a stock, and he's acted consistently with that to his purchase.

He's then sold. Well, guess what happens minutes later? He's bought again. And that's part of the entire

context that we -- it is incumbent upon us to be prepared to 1 2 present to the jury. So it's not as simple as look at the trading records; 11:05:22 3 he made this statement; then what did he do. What was he doing 4 5 beforehand? What is he doing in the seconds after hand? think that will be very impactful for the trier of fact. 6 Thank you, Your Honor. 11:05:35 11:05:39 8 MS. SOLANO: Your Honor, may I approach? 11:05:40 9 THE COURT: You may. MS. SOLANO: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is 11:05:4710 Jamie Solano. I'm new to this case, but I represent Edward 11 12 Constantinescu. I would just like to add a few more issues that are specific to this time period that we find ourselves in 13 14 immediately prior to trial and why the defense, or at least our 15 team, can't be ready by the trial date. 11:06:0916 In addition to the issue relayed with the text 17 messages and the text messages not lining up, the reason why that matters so much in this case, Your Honor, is because the 18 19 government's made a decision, on its exhibit list, not to include the underlying substantive evidence. And so this isn't 20 21 a case --THE COURT: Meaning? 11:06:2922 11:06:3123 MS. SOLANO: What I mean by that, Your Honor, is that the government's exhibits, the majority of them, are recreated, 24

and they didn't -- it's not like a typical case where they've

25

11:07:3617

11:07:5623

11:07:1310

11:06:51

got all of the underlying trading records or the screen grab of the actual text message or five screen grabs of the actual text message, and then they've put it all together in a summary.

They just included the summary, and in doing that, every single one of these summary exhibits, we have to go back into the millions and millions of records, some of which the data is so voluminous our team doesn't have access to right now, and we have to go find where it is, and then we have to line it up and see if it's actually accurate.

And there are several occasions which that preliminary step has been done, and it is not accurate. And when we're talking about 900-plus, a thousand exhibits where we have to go redo this, and we don't have the underlying bases, that makes our job incredibly difficult as defense attorneys to be in a position where we can explain this is a misleading exhibit, Your Honor.

In addition, the government's made several productions after the production deadline, and each time it makes these productions, it creates more and more issues that we have to dig into. And, Your Honor, I was an AUSA up until two and a half months ago, so I understand that it is difficult, and as you get ready for trial, things come up.

But by way of one example, we received a production on August 16th. So a few weeks ago. It's the government's 20th production letter saying that they're producing additional

11:09:0317

11:08:15

materials that relate to their testifying witnesses and material that they obtained as a result of the search warrants in the case.

Now, there's at least two things that are very problematic about this August 16th production. One of them is, buried within it, is an e-mail from their government -- from one of the government's testifying witnesses to the lead prosecutor in this case, and it's from September of 2022. And in that e-mail, this government witness who is going to be testifying about the tweets and the data that he analyzed, says, quote, I don't want to hold up this delivery, but I want to note that I noticed some discrepancies in the timestamps of some of the tweets as reported by Axiom, while checking over the results. If the timestamps of certain tweets are important, I would recommend referring back to the original text files from Twitter. I can walk you through that process, if necessary.

Now, Your Honor, what this means -- or what this seems to mean is that there was a forensic tool run against the data that the government obtained from Twitter, and there is -- when you look at the reports from that forensic tool, there's a problem with the timestamps. If that's the case, Your Honor, then we need -- we did not know that there was a problem with the timestamps, and so to the extent the government has produced these exports, which it appears from the production they have, and there's any discrepancy with the timestamps, we need to make

11:10:4218

11:10:5722

11:11:0023

11:09:53

sure that we have sufficient time to go back and look at the underlying text files that came from Twitter to see if there's a discrepancy that matters to the timing of these trades and the timing of the tweets.

So that's one -- that's one problem, Your Honor.

There's an additional issue based on what it looks like the government was doing in producing and processing the data, which relates to a suppression issue, which I'm not going to put before Your Honor in this moment, but the point is, Your Honor, each and every time the government has added new productions and new information to us, it has left us with more things that we have to -- that we have to research; more issues that we have to compare. And this is not an instance where we can look at the exhibit list, we have the summary, we can compare the summary to the underlying evidence, the underlying exhibits that are supposed to represent that, and see if we think there's a discrepancy.

We are forced to look at only summary exhibits, and then we have to go crawl back into a massive database, some of which, at least for our team, is not currently accessible to us, and we have to see if we can line it up --

THE COURT: Why is that? Why is it not accessible?

MS. SOLANO: Because certain of the data is too dense,

and so we have -- we were not able to open some of the government's productions. So we had to send it out to a

11:12:1720

11:11:4211

11:11:22

third-party processor. Currently, the third-party processor has those productions in a database, but because some of the files are electronic and so large, we are not able to actually view them, nor are we able to download them.

We were okay with this strategy for now because we wanted to wait and see what would actually end up on the government's exhibit list, and then you can see if this is actually a problem or if this is electronic data that, ultimately, doesn't really matter, and because there are synthesized export reports of some of this material.

However, when we got the government's exhibits, the government did not put its underlying evidence as the exhibits. It only has these summaries, and so we are now forced to go back in through the productions. Now we have a concern whether there's a timestamp problem with some of the exports that the government has produced, so we shouldn't be relying on those, and now we have to go back and -- so that we can check and make sure that each of these actually say what the government says they -- they are reflecting, and that's an enormous task.

And in addition, Your Honor, these summary charts, which we're not -- I'm not going to get into at length, but the summary charts with the trades, they have, as -- as Mr. Rosen highlighted, they've got all these sells and all these buys, but they also have tweets that are pulled in and interchanged and intermingled. And the way in which they -- the defendants are

11:13:2714

11:13:4516

11:13:5819

11:14:2124

11:12:54

kind of lumped into each of these episodes, sometimes the defendant is lumped into an episode when he hasn't said anything alleged to be false at all.

And so this isn't a situation where, Well, you knew that we -- you know, we had this synthesized list of false statements, so you knew that that is what was going to be the issue, and so you could have focused on that. Now we have to look at our client involved in episodes picked up by the government where he didn't say anything false at all, and they don't even contest that he didn't say anything false at all.

But now we have to also put our attention on those episodes in addition to what we thought -- where we thought the ball was headed in -- to begin with.

So under those circumstances, Your Honor, and for those reasons, our team needs a continuance in this case.

MR. FERTITTA: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm Zachary Fertitta. I represent Gary Deel. We also have a motion for continuance, and my comments will echo those of cocounsel's.

Part of the problem here is in data handling. I'm going to approach this from strictly a data-driven standpoint. We've received 20 productions over the course of seven months, and I compliment the DOJ on their hard work. We -- and the massive volume of that.

We need time to assess that data. We need time to do the same volume of work, perhaps even more. Here's why: Each

11:15:2114

11:15:5219

11:16:0622

11:14:44

11:14:58

of these productions are password protected. There are thousands of files where a password has to be entered in order to access the data. Some of the data is enormous.

So then we have to take that sometimes to third

So then we have to take that sometimes to third parties, but we -- I've assembled an entire data processing team. They are not working normal hours. They're working well beyond normal hours to process this data.

Absent from the government's production is real market data, and I can get very specific on that. If you'll -- I filed an affidavit from one of our team members yesterday in which he details -- and I -- I'll just -- I'll be brief in this. He details some of the data that is missing from the government's production -- real market data.

Specifically, with the stock ticker TRCH, during the relevant trading period that -- that is referred to in the superseding indictment, there is an article posted on Nasdaq.com, the official website for Nasdaq, where the title of it is "Torchlight Energy shares are blazing higher today."

That article details real market factors and corporate information. That's a real data point. That is a real market moving fact when it's on Nasdaq.com.

If you -- also at that time, Mr. Lewis's client, it is alleged, was posting about TRCH. It is alleged in the indictment he had 125,000 Twitter followers. At the time he traded and posted about TRCH, he actually had 4,500 Twitter

followers. That's a big gap.

11:18:0723

11:17:1913

11:16:38

11:16:45

11:16:58

It's hard to move the market with 4,500 Twitter followers. I don't think that's going to happen.

These are the market -- these are the real data points that we have to go and use external sources to find to fill in these gaps.

Also, not included in any of the government's material are -- is the notion that there may be bots involved in Twitter followings. Now, there's a lot of debate over the percentage of bots, but there is zero data in the government's production related to bots and how many of their Twitter followers were actually bots.

So you've got a multi-disciplined approach that we have to take to get accurate data, both market data at the time of these trades, Twitter data at the time of these trades, and how that could potentially impact the market, and this takes an enormous amount of time multiplied times seven codefendants, 20 productions, and 397 discrete trading incidents that have been given to us. We can't take the chance of not doing that research. In order to give an effective defense, we have to dig in and do this research and look to all these external market — market and data points.

Also missing from the government's production is all of the data from -- the coding data from the Atlas Discord channel which was taken down. All these posts took -- a lot of

11:19:12 12

11:19:2616

11:19:3018

11:18:31

these posts at issue took place on the Atlas platform. We don't have access to a lot of that data. We have to go find it, and we are actively doing that.

The underlying code will -- will give us warnings, subscriber agreements, the agreements and attestations that the subscribers had to sign and acknowledge, and educational resources that were made available to them, which is absent from the government's production, warnings -- all of these things are absent from the government's production that we have to go seek out on our own. It takes a lot of time. We are working very diligently, but this is a huge task.

To say it's complicated is the understatement of the year. It is a Herculean task, and for that reason,

Mr. Cooperman and Mr. Matlock filed jointly asking for a continuance. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Cordova, you don't have to do any of this?

MS. CORDOVA: Your Honor, I agree with everything they've said about the government's production. In my experience, and what we would ask the Court, is that the proper remedy is exclusion; it's not allowing the government more time making the defendants suffer longer under this indictment. The government waited six months, till June, to even identify these purportedly false statements. That's not how it's supposed to work under the Speedy Trial Act. The government's supposed to

be ready to go within 60 days.

11:20:5119

11:20:5721

11:21:0924

11:20:2510

11:19:55

They clearly were not, and that should not be something that prejudices our -- our clients. They get a speedy trial. That's their constitutional right, and the fact that the government has created all these issues, the -- the solution is exclusion. Go back to the indictment. We still have a motion to dismiss on the counts where the government never even identified in the indictment false statements by our client or what -- when the trades were, anything.

None of that is in the indictment, and so our position, and what we would ask the Court, is that we go to trial in October, and we exclude -- if they don't produce the Jencks material for their testifying agent, he doesn't get to testify. In our experience, and my experience as a former federal prosecutor and as a defense attorney, that's the proper remedy, not to violate the defendants' Sixth Amendment rights by forcing them to wait longer for the government to get their case together.

THE COURT: Anybody else from the defense want to weigh in before I let the government respond?

MR. REYES: Thank you, Your Honor. Just briefly,
Your Honor, "Lu" Reyes -- or Luis Reyes on behalf of Mr. Perry
Matlock.

We had filed and joined the motion that Mr. Fertitta had just explained to the Court, the bases of -- for his claim,

11:22:0917

11:22:2021

11:21:4510

11:21:24

Mr. Deel. But I did want to add a couple things, and I'll make it brief because you've already heard a lot of the technicalities involved in this case.

But, Your Honor, this really is a Sixth Amendment issue. For the reasons you've heard my colleagues explain, there is a very real concern that we cannot provide the effective assistance by October 23. So in case anyone's counting, we would tally a vote in that favor for the continuance.

But to be brief, Your Honor, the complexity is something we've not seen before, but there's some very, very important things that have happened just in the last -- less than a month, and that -- what my colleagues talked about in terms of the exhibits just three weeks ago that we received have evidence -- purported evidence that they would want to take back into the jury room that isn't even accurate.

But what we're having to do is go through all of those, every single one, to make sure we understand the bases and, of course, challenge it as appropriate, which takes away time.

But the timestamps that -- that Mr. Constantinescu's attorney talked about is extremely important as well. What we're talking about are statements -- a review of behavior with statements made at a certain second in the day, and then buying and then trading volume right after. If those aren't correct in

11:24:0524

11:23:4317

11:22:59

the time, that changes the whole bases of how we're going to approach our case, and it could strengthen -- it could strengthen our case quite a bit one way or the -- you know, at least depending on how these things are actually -- so we need the actual time. We need to actually go back through.

But I would be remiss, Your Honor -- and this is my final point -- if I didn't mention that another reason for continuance is that there are currently motions for Brady material pending, and -- and I will let, you know, Mr. O'Brien [sic] or Mr. Constantinescu's counsel talk in more detail about this. It was their motion which we joined, but it's very crucial material that we believe is crucial to the defense, and that has to do with the fact that the SEC has stated that there are -- it is not determined what may have caused the buying volume on certain of the underlying stocks in the government's case, and that is information that the jury has to hear.

And what we need, Your Honor, and what's the basis of that motion is the -- the SEC documents that -- their analysis. They put together seven factors. They put together reports. We don't have it, and our position is that this was a joint investigation that the FBI did with SEC, that they have these documents or they have access to them, and that we need them before we can go to trial.

That was the basis of a motion filed in July, and, you know, we really need that before we go to trial. It goes to the

causation of -- the underlying causation, which they have made 1 2 very clearly a point in their case, that our guys caused, somehow, the market to move; that our guys caused, somehow, for 3 there to be harm. There's actually clear exculpatory evidence 4 out there that we haven't received yet that they -- by the 5 government itself that we need to have in our hands and that a 6 7 jury would need to see. And with that, Your Honor, I appreciate the Court's 11:24:37 8 attention. 9 MR. MALLETT: May I approach, Your Honor? 11:24:4510 11:24:4611 THE COURT: You may. 11:24:4912 MR. MALLETT: Good morning. I'm Edward Mallett. 13 here with Mr. Stefan Hrvatin, who's sitting on the front to the

Court's right.

14

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

11:24:5815

11:25:1919

11:25:5325

I am mindful of the Court's comment that you often learn about the case the same time the jury does, but I would not want the defense to learn about the government's case at the same time the jury does.

Our motion to adopt the other motion for continuance is general, and it's document No. 383. I want to start, though, by saying this: Mr. Hrvatin is a day trader. That means he trades in and out of an identical stock multiple times on the same day, often making a very small profit or taking a small loss on individual trades.

In the records the government has kindly shared with

11:26:36 9

11:26:4712

11:27:1217

11:27:3723

11:27:4325

us, and in records Mr. Hrvatin is able to provide, I have found cases where he's bought or sold the same stock in what we call "round trips," 15 to 20 times in the same day. Sometimes he will sell a stock for a small profit, and then, a few minutes later, buy the same stock at a higher price than he just sold for because if he can make \$2,000 on a \$100,000 position -- a 2 percent gain -- and do that ten times, he's made \$20,000 in one day. That's pretty good by the hour.

He's cautious to watch carefully and use limit orders to both buy at a good price and get out if the market moves against him.

Also, Mr. Hrvatin never recommends or tells anyone who is interested in his Twitter postings to buy a stock. He will state, as the evidence will show, that he believes a particular stock is good, but that doesn't mean that it's good. In fact, other market forces may cause him to be proven incorrect.

He only has to be correct most of the time to have -- make a living as a day trader, working in his home, constantly trading in and out of the stocks that he is favoring in a particular period of time. So those are facts that the Court needs to know about at least one defendant, and the only defendant for whom I speak.

He is not in partnership, collaboration, or conspiracy with the others. He is trading on his own.

In the motions pending are requests for the trading

11:28:4013

11:29:0819

11:29:3825

11:28:07

records of the codefendants because I believe that if they will be produced by the government -- and I believe the government has them. And if they don't have them, I don't know why they don't -- we can show that he is -- trades independently of the activity of codefendants.

Now, my motion starts with this declaration: Haste makes waste. And I chide the government, and now I'm kind of embarrassed about it, for titling a motion a response to Constantinescu's motion to compel when it's really an opposition to Rybarczyk's motion for continuance and Hennessey's motion for severance. So haste makes waste when lawyers are trying to meet deadlines and get things filed as promptly as possible.

In my particular case, we filed an exhibit list,

No. 388, in which item 21 says defendant's e-mails to be

selected and filed. That's a mistake. The government kindly

has agreed not to oppose a motion to amend the exhibit list and

change the word "e-mails" to "tweets." That's my mistake trying

to get it done.

Yesterday, one day late, I was able to speak to the witnesses that Mr. Hrvatin had recommended would be helpful to him, interview them by phone, and file an unopposed motion to extend the date from the 5th to the 6th, and that is pending. The government doesn't oppose it. Haste makes waste. I didn't get it done on the 5th. I just ran out of time.

The government produces discovery in the most helpful

11:30:3714

11:31:0019

11:31:1623

11:30:09

way it can. We ask for something, and they send us something. For example, I'm not complaining about their violating the discovery cutoff of June 5th, but I'm holding an envelope that was mailed out on -- dated August 29th for overnight delivery, and it explains inside that this disk -- I'm holding up an envelope, and it has what we call a thumb drive in it.

And they explain in the letter that the material on this particular thumb drive are provided in response to what another defendant requested and that we will soon be provided the password to this thumb drive by e-mail. Now, I can't defend and always say the government is right and never makes mistakes. They provide the discovery. I need to at least take a look at it.

I'm not aware that we have yet to receive the password for what I have numbered production No. 22, and I -- it may be 23, but I -- as their envelopes come in, I write down numbers. So in my motion I state, at paragraph 2, that I am several productions behind. I've got envelopes like this.

Now, I am just a solo practitioner. I am sharing expenses with other lawyers. I have retained and paid and am paying by the hour an information technology consultant to assist me in getting these materials.

He advises that if the timestamps on the spreadsheets provided by the government lack integrity, then they will not truthfully report the actual time that Mr. Hrvatin traded in a

11:33:1722

11:33:2123

11:33:2425

11:32:2912

11:32:4115

11:31:48

stock. That concerns me because he is doing this rapid-fire trading all day long trying to profit and, in fact, profiting on small margins.

I may be corrected by the government, but I think it's in their expert report that, in materials she studied, he profited \$600,000 and change about which they have complaints. That is a small figure for a three-year period of time in which they are claiming that others made a great deal more money. The very variance between his income and the income of the others I think puts -- rebuts the claim that he is acting in some kind of partnership with other people in violation of the law.

I do have other cases. I've stopped taking other cases. I stopped in July. I declined a case yesterday when I got a call from the magistrate's court.

I'll work on this full-time. I think we can make that possible. We've budgeted it because we knew it would be protracted litigation, but I need to learn about it before the trial and not during the trial. If I do not, then I fear his constitutional rights to effective assistance of counsel and due process of law will be in jeopardy. Therefore, we ask the Court for additional time.

THE COURT: Who wants to respond from the government?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning,

Scott Armstrong for the record.

There is a lot to respond to in all of that. I think

11:34:1711

11:34:4217

11:34:5421

that just sitting here listening to it, it's unique in that the issues that are being described are intelligent issues, and the issues that are being described are not unique issues, and the issues that are being described, 45 days from trial, are not issues that cannot adequately be resolved and prepared for in the normal course, given the steps that we have taken in this case to tee up every single one of these issues, such as the trading records, such as the social media posts, and producing and giving defendants exhibits in this case 45 days -- I'm sorry, 75 days before trial as Your Honor requested.

That is two and a half months before trial, an almost unheard of production deadline, and we haven't gone back, and we haven't said, "Oh, by the way, we want to add these exhibits," or, "Oh, by the way, we left off ten exhibits here or, you know, nine exhibits there." We tried to be as faithful as we could to the deadline and given exhibits 75 days before trial.

And so a lot of this stuff that we're hearing right now in this hearing is just a complete sideshow and completely irrelevant to what the actual evidence will be at trial and what is actually admissible at trial.

Just taking some examples that we heard this morning from Mr. Rosen: How is it possible that it is relevant evidence to just introduce random statements from who knows who about stocks; or Mr. Cooperman's attorney, his example about -Mr. Lewis, his example about how press releases are just

admissible?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

11:36:2322

11:36:2925

11:35:16

11:35:31

11:35:36 9

11:35:5815

There has to be some foundational hook that the defendant actually saw this material. You can't just wholesale dump in evidence from who knows where from what corner of the Internet and say that's admissible evidence and not hearsay. So to a large extent, a lot of these issues --

THE COURT: They're saying that about your summaries as well.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Understood, Your Honor, but our summaries are categorically different. Our summaries are their own statements and their own trades. I think that -- that comes in all day under 801(d)(2)(E) and 801(d)(2)(A). So there's a categorical difference between a press release grabbed from the Internet and the defendants' own statements.

On Ms. Cordova's point about we were, you know, dilatory in producing the false statements, you know, sometimes there's selective amnesia, but my recollection is we all sat in the courtroom and decided, back in March, the exact date we would be producing our expert report that would include the false statements. So to cry foul after we complied with that and produced them in June strikes me as a little bit untoward.

Your Honor, there -- I have tons of issues here that I can discuss. I don't think Your Honor wants to hear about all of them, but I'm happy to address them --

THE COURT: Let's take the severance issue.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. 11:36:31 1 11:36:33 THE COURT: We have a motion to sever, and Ms. Cordova says she's ready to go to trial. 3 MR. ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, how is that not compelling 11:36:39 evidence that if you want to be ready, you can be ready? On the 5 law, I think that she is incorrect in that. The law in the 6 7 Fifth Circuit, and even in the Supreme Court, is clear that you have to show compelling prejudice -- the most compelling 8 prejudice, and that normally comes when you have irreconcilable 9 or mutually antagonistic defenses. 10 So, for example, if you have two defendants, and one 11:37:0311 says, "The other defendant shot the guy, not me," that's a good 12 example for a severance. But just saying, "I want to go on my 13 own schedule. Everyone else can do what they like," is not 14 compelling prejudice of the most significant degree to warrant a 15 16 severance, especially --11:37:2117 **THE COURT:** The fact it's been designated a complex case, does that get you around any speedy trial issue? 18 MR. ARMSTRONG: In what sense, Your Honor? 11:37:2919 11:37:3020 THE COURT: Well, she's saying her client's speedy trial rights have been violated. 21 MR. ARMSTRONG: I'm definitely not a speedy trial 11:37:4022 guru, but I would say that they're tried together in a 23 conspiracy, and the Supreme Court law that I'm aware of is that 24

if you are tried together in a conspiracy, the general rule is

25

that everyone goes to trial together and that any intervening 1 2 time is, therefore, tolled until everyone is ready to go. Your Honor, there are a number of issues I can 11:38:05 3 address, you know. The gravamen of this case and the difficulty 4 5 in this case is that we produced things very, very early, and, you know, I'm not going to sit here and, you know, take pot 6 7 shots, but we did that for a reason, and now we're being told, oh, by the way, no one's ready. And the reason why no one's 8 ready is for reasons that, quite frankly, don't bear a lot of 9 10 fruit and aren't very compelling when they're trying to chase issues and chase causation examples and chase causation theories 11 12 that should not be admissible in the first place. THE COURT: All right. Let's shift over before I talk 11:38:4513 14 about the trial setting. I've heard two -- I think Constantinescu has -- Mr. Williams, maybe it's you -- have the 15 most -- you have the most motions to compel outstanding. 16 11:39:1017 MR. WILLIAMS: No, Your Honor. Those are Mr. Constantinescu's motions to compel, Mr. --18 11:39:1419 THE COURT: Okay. MR. WILLIAMS: We have a motion related to the 11:39:1420 evidence that if -- in the event -- in the event continuance is 21 denied, but we'll defer on that till your trial --22 THE COURT: Let's talk about -- go ahead and have a 11:39:2323

THE COURT: Let's talk about -- go ahead and have a seat, Mr. Armstrong. Let's talk about -- because I think this ties in to when we go to trial. If they're missing evidence, I

24

25

want to know what it is. So tell me what you -- issues you think exist.

11:40:1212

11:40:2817

11:40:5122

11:39:41

MR. FORD: Well, I can say with a high degree of certainty that it exists. We currently have three outstanding Brady motions of material that we know exist and we believe it's highly exculpatory. That's why we've brought it to the Court's attention. I'm going to allow my colleague, Ms. Solano, to speak about one of them. I'd like to speak about the most important, which is our second motion to compel Brady material related to the SEC's finding -- findings about the exact stocks that we're talking about here today.

I'll start by saying I'm actually shocked by what Mr. Armstrong just said to conclude his presentation, that he does not believe causation is at issue. I'm shocked for two reasons. First is this cutesy term "pump-and-dump" that we hear.

It has historically been used in the securities field to describe a specific type of securities fraud, one in which false statements are issued by an insider which causes the price to go up. The sales by the insider then cause the stock to go down. That's how we came up with that cute term.

If we are not talking about these individual defendants causing the changes in price of these stocks, there are no profits, and there are no losses attributable to them, then we are here -- after thousands of newspaper articles

11:41:5814

11:42:1118

11:41:20

smearing my client's name, we are here talking about what could be no more, after trial, than a technical violation for which nobody made any money and nobody suffered any losses.

So we have received the government's expert reports. The expert reports do not disclose that they will be speaking about causation; however, the exhibit list tells a different story. And each of these so-called exhibits, which are actually fabricated pieces of evidence by the government -- each one of them suggest that the government is going to put on a causation case whereby they say that my client said, "Hey, here's a stock, and here's a little meme about it." That's what caused the price to go up, and people bought it, and when the price went down, they lost money.

That's going to be their case. They're going to try and back-door it. Whatever Mr. Armstrong just said when we go to trial, I can assure you he's going to try and back-door this causation issue. That's -- brings me to the motion to compel.

They allege that Mr. Constantinescu made \$80 million as part of this scheme. I have attributed no less than 59 million of that to stocks that the Securities and Exchange Commission looked at and determined were meme stocks for which the volume and price increases were indeterminate. In fact, Maxine Waters, in -- very early in 2021, in February, she ordered a congressional hearing on this. There was a Senate follow-on.

During that, there was -- former chair of the SEC 11:42:37 2 testified, the then-acting SEC chair submitted letters, and now the current SEC chair, Gary Gensler, came and testified to 3 Congress. 4 The issue before the Congress was these -- these meme 11:42:52 5 stocks, GameStop, AMC, NAKD, Sundial, Express, JAGX, what caused 6 7 this to happen? And the chair of the SEC stood up and said there was a lot of things that caused it to happen --8 THE COURT: Okay. But those aren't at issue here, 11:43:11 9 though, are they? 10 11:43:1411 MR. FORD: Oh, they are. That is --11:43:1612 THE COURT: GameStop is at issue here? 11:43:1713 MR. FORD: No. AM- -- NAKD, my client made 14 \$9.7 million. Between January -- between January of 2021 and March 1st of 2021, my client made over \$50 million primarily on 15 a handful of stocks. NAKD, he made over 9,000,000. Sundial, he 16 17 made over 17,000,000. Express, he made over 3,000,000. And I can go down the list, all meme stocks. 18 11:43:4119 Those are listed in the government's calculation of their \$114 million number, and they are listed in the 397 20 episodes. 21 THE COURT: Okay. They're not in the indictment, 11:43:5222 though? 23 MR. FORD: They are not in the indictment. 11:43:5424 11:43:5625 THE COURT: Okay. Well, see, this is where I'm at a

disadvantage. You guys know about 397. I know about the ten or 11 that are listed in the indictment.

MR. FORD: Right.

11:44:3813

11:44:5218

11:44:04

11:44:04

And what they -- what they've said in their filings now, though, is that they plan to use those 397 as proof of the -- as proof of the conspiracy, one, and then as 404(b). So they do plan on coming in and talking about these stocks. This is a major issue in this case because the manner in which my client talked about and traded stocks -- those stocks is no different than any of the other ones. And we will see, as you learn the facts, that the way my client traded is very different than anything that the government is -- is presenting.

The issue is this: There is no doubt -- no doubt, based on what we submitted to the Court, that the SEC, the DOJ, and the FBI have been involved in a joint investigation. In fact, the way it appears to us is that the SEC has been driving the bus.

Within weeks of the DOJ opening this case, they were on the phone with the SEC requesting the information. Our first production from the government, almost all SEC materials. They have been in active communication with the SEC throughout the duration. It's where they've found their defendants; it's where they found many of their supposed victims; it's how they obtained trade records, Twitter, Atlas, and Discord records; how they obtained search warrants. They conducted at least over a

dozen interviews jointly with the SEC.

11:46:2818

11:45:5510

11:45:26

They did an investigation with the SEC. They issued their charging instruments on the exact same day, December 14th, 2022, which, not by coincidence, the chair of the SEC put a video out and a press release on the same exact day that these guys were indicted saying that they were altering the rules on dark pool trading and, subsequently, that they would be altering the rules on short selling in order to deal with the meme stock phenomenon that occurred throughout 2021.

Your Honor, I believe that once I have access to this exculpatory information in the SEC's possession, I can show that at least 75,000,000 of the 80,000,000 attributable to my client came from stocks that the SEC investigated and determined experienced price increases and decreases because of factors that had nothing to do and were far outside of the control of my client. That other 5,000,000, truthfully, it's stuff he didn't really talk about. I don't know how it ended up in this case.

But this causation issue, we have got to make a decision, and I think we've got to make it here today. We either exclude the causation element, the government cannot say that these guys caused the price to go up and down, and, therefore, we have no profit and no loss — that's one option — or, two, we need access to all of the SEC's investigatory file over the past two and a half years when they investigated these episodes.

But I -- we do not think that it is reasonable or fair to allow the government to stand up and say my client made 2 3 \$80 million or, combined, these gentlemen made \$114 million when I now know that the overwhelming majority -- overwhelming 4 majority of what my client made came from what the SEC has 5 deemed to be meme stocks that were caused by many, many factors, 6 7 none of which had anything to do with Mr. Constantinescu. THE COURT: What's your position on whether these 11:47:21 8 stocks not mentioned in the indictment should be -- even be 9 admissible?

think we should be discussing them.

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

11:48:0121

11:47:3111

11:47:3814

MR. FORD: I don't think they should be admissible. agree with Mr. Rybarczyk's attorneys on that point. I don't

The problem that we get, then, is now they just dragged my client through the mud for \$80 million, and we're going to show up at trial, and they'll be hard-pressed to -- to even come up with evidence on a few hundred thousand, because I'm telling you all of this money that he made, he bought stocks and held them during these huge waves of this meme stock phenomenon, and that's where all that money came from.

They should not be allowed to wave around a paper in front of the jury and say he made \$80 million. So I think the decision is I would -- I would concede they can't talk about those other episodes, but the follow-on is I think they should be precluded, and we plan to move in limine, if need be -- or we

can have the conversation today -- that they should be prevented 1 2 from discussing any of the stocks that the SEC were -determined to be meme stocks. 3 Now, I don't have a list in my possession, but what I 11:48:26 have is the congressional hearing testimony that I've read 5 through. I've scoured over thousands of pages of congressional 6 7 testimony and add-ons on this exact issue. 11:48:39 8 THE COURT: Okay. MR. FORD: And these stock tickers that I'm naming, 11:48:40 9 and I -- I'll say them again, that my client made money on NAKD, 10 that episode that appears in their expert's --11 THE COURT: You may -- spell that. 11:48:4912 11:48:5113 MR. FORD: N-A-K-D; Sundial, S-N-D-L; JAGX, J-A-G-X; 14 Express, E-X-P-R; H-O-F-V; Koss, K-O-S-S. I can go down the list of these. 15 11:49:0616 These are in the definition of meme stock in Maxine 17 Waters's hearing that she organized before Congress. These are the exact stocks that current acting SEC chair, Gary Gensler, 18 19 was talking about when he stood in front of Congress. This case -- this is a big case. This is bigger than 11:49:2120 what the SEC is representing. This is something that has been 21 on the mind of all three branches of the United States 22 government since it happened in January and February of 2021, 23 and nobody could come up with a good excuse as to how it was 24

that we saw so many stocks going to the moon.

25

11:49:47 11:50:05 11:50:2210

> 7 8

> > 9

5

11:50:2411

12 13

11:50:3414 15

16

17

18

19 20

11:51:0321

22

23

24 25 records, do you feel fall under Brady that you don't have? MR. FORD: There's -- there's two other categories.

I'm going -- I'll discuss one very briefly, and then I'm going to turn it over to Ms. Solano to discuss the next.

THE COURT: What other documents, besides the SEC

1099-Bs, these are tax summaries that are issued and required to be issued by all broker dealers. They are sent to the IRS. We have, in our possession, tax records from Webull. Now --

THE COURT: From what?

MR. FORD: Webull, W-E-B-U-L-L. That's a broker dealer that some of the defendants used. My client primarily used TD Ameritrade.

What I have and what I've seen is the same grand -what appears to be the same grand jury subpoena that goes out to Webull and TD Ameritrade, the prosecutors here, in communication with TD Ameritrade, pressuring them to -- to -- you know, to get these documents. We then wind up with the Webull 1099-Bs, but we don't have any from TD Ameritrade, TradeZero, which defendant PJ Matlock primarily used, and several other 1099-Bs.

The reason these are so -- these are essential to our I think it is impossible -- impossible for anybody to look at my client's 1099-Bs and believe that, one, he was doing anything wrong, and -- in general, and, two, that he was involved in a conspiracy.

11:52:3624

11:52:0515

11:51:42

What they are is they're concise descriptions of trading activity straight from the source, straight from the broker dealer. What we got in our possession, over a million documents. I believe it represents over 50,000,000 pages, trade records that pour on endlessly. What they did is they gave it to an expert, and they picked and they chose, right, to create this.

But what we don't have is the concise end-of-year 1099-B tax records. They disprove things so easily, right?

During the last hearing, Mr. Armstrong stood up and said, "Look, he said -- on December 13th, he said it was a great stock, and then he sold it." But when you look at the 1099-B, what it reveals is that on the following day, he bought right into that stock, and then he continued to do so over the next few weeks.

So we can do that without, one, creating misleading summaries, as the government is doing; two, without requiring the jury to look at literally -- literally tens of millions of trades represented in tens of millions of entries on Excel spreadsheets. I think these 1099-Bs are essential, and what I'd like to be able to do, truthfully, Your Honor, is I'd like to take the other codefendants and line all seven or eight of them up and say, "Look at this. These guys didn't trade together."

So that's why I think those are important.

The third category Ms. Solano's going to deal with. I think this is very critical to this case, and so I hope you'll

also give her some attention to discuss this third category of 1 2 Brady material. If you have any other questions --THE COURT: Yes. Let me ask the defense lawyers 11:52:50 3 present: Is there -- if I were to order 1099-Bs, that would 4 essentially be ordering your tax -- your client's tax 5 records -- or at least this portion of them, to be -- to the 6 7 codefendants for them to see. Does anyone object to that? Obviously, you could enter a protective order that 11:53:18 8 they not be disclosed outside the confines of the case. 9 MR. LEWIS: No objection from Mr. Cooperman, 11:53:2710 11 Your Honor. MR. REYES: No objection from Matlock, Your Honor. 11:53:2912 11:53:3113 MR. HILDER: No objection from Mr. Rybarczyk. MR. FERTITTA: No objection from Mr. Deel. 11:53:3314 11:53:3615 MS. CORDOVA: No objection from Mr. Hennessey. 11:53:3916 MR. MALLETT: No objection. 11:53:4017 THE COURT: All right. The third category? MR. ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, could I address that one? 11:53:4218 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to let you address all 11:53:4319 three of them in a minute. 20 11:53:4721 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. 11:53:5022 THE COURT: I just wanted to get rid of the -- if we're going to have a privacy issue, I wanted to know before we 23 got down that road. 24 MS. SOLANO: Thank you, Your Honor. So the issue that 11:53:5925

I'm here to address on this point is a disagreement that we have 1 with the government on what would be considered Brady material, 2 and it pertains to two, kind of, buckets. 3 We've got information where the government -- the 11:54:09 government's investigative team either did not investigate that 5 one of its own FBI agents had received \$100,000 in trading 6 7 profits during the time period -- that was obtained during the time period that they've alleged is a conspiracy time period and 8 any investigative efforts to either seek out and have that money 9 returned, or they determined that that money was actually not 10 trading profits, and so they were fine having an FBI agent keep 11

12

13

17

19

20

21

22

23

11:54:4914

11:54:5215

11:54:5416

11:54:5718

11:55:1724

11:55:1925

THE COURT: And how do you know about that?

have said is an illegal conspiracy involving my client --

this money even though it was obtained during the time that they

MS. SOLANO: How do we know about the transfer?

THE COURT: About the -- an FBI agent that invested and made 100 grand.

MS. SOLANO: So, Your Honor, in the bank records that were produced in the course of discovery. In the bank records of my client, you can see on the bank records themselves that there's \$100,000 in the name of this FBI agent that goes to the FBI agent, and this FBI agent is the brother-in-law of my client's estranged wife.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MS. SOLANO: And so the reason why that -- we think

11:56:4725

11:56:1416

11:55:47

that that is exculpatory is what it appears from the government's subsequent filings, ECF No. 346, that they filed on January 31st, it suggests that their financial analyst and the financial agent who has been on this case and is a part of the investigative team missed this -- missed this \$100,000 transfer and didn't know about it or didn't care about it until after it was raised.

And the reason why we think that that's so important, Your Honor, is, one, I believe that it is squarely Brady information surrounding either the lack of investigation or that they investigated it, and they determined it didn't matter, because it goes to criticizing the government's investigation, attacking the credibility of the investigation, which under Kyles v. Whitley is definitely Brady material. So that is one bucket.

And there is also a potential that if there is a reason that they didn't care that this agent had the hundred thousand dollars, if it's because there's an estranged wife situation, I have no idea, but that would be Brady material, and that is the first bucket, that if they have that material, if they have that information, they need to be producing it to us, including the financial disclosure form that this special agent said he disclosed -- he said that he disclosed this \$100,000 on a financial disclosure form with the FBI.

It's also important, Your Honor, that any Brady

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

11:57:5118

11:58:0822

11:58:1123

11:58:1424

11:58:1625

11:57:2210

material we get on this -- because the government put in a seizure warrant affidavit, and in that seizure warrant affidavit they made a lot of representations about all of Eddie's money -- nearly all of Eddie's money being dirty money, right, which if it's -- if \$100,000 was provided to an FBI agent, and that wasn't disclosed in the seizure warrant affidavit, or it wasn't provided in the analysis, then I think that that is fair game when their testifying witnesses get up on the stand, and we can cross-examine them on that.

Now, the agent who's the affiant on those seizure warrants is not on their witness list; however, the financial analyst, who is on their witness list, at least through the course of discovery, it looks like she had a large part in drafting and preparing that affidavit. And if she missed this \$100,000, or if she knew about it and chose not to put it in this paper that went before the Court, I think all of that is fair game to attack the credibility of the investigation.

The second bucket, Your Honor, is conversations that one of the prosecutors was having about this case and about my client's assets with his wife's divorce attorney. Now, I don't know what those conversations were because they weren't --

THE COURT: Let's take that up later.

MS. SOLANO: Yes, Your Honor. That's all I have.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Armstrong?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Um --

THE COURT: Or Mr. Carter. Whoever wants to weigh in. 11:58:16 1 11:58:21 MR. ARMSTRONG: Again, Your Honor, a lot to unpack. Let's start with just the EXPR and correct the record just a 3 4 little bit because the facts are important, and there are a lot of things being put before Your Honor that are of questionable 5 source material, to say the least -- to say the absolute least. 6 Can I have the ELMO, Your Honor? 11:58:44 7 11:58:46 8 THE COURT: Yeah. Don't ask me; ask Rhonda. THE CASE MANAGER: It's not plugged in. 11:58:50 9 11:58:5610 MR. ARMSTRONG: I can still stretch. 11:58:5811 Okay. Well, I don't need the ELMO. Your Honor, this 12 is Government Exhibit -- I believe it's 120, and -- may I 13 approach? 11:59:1014 (Document handed to the Court.) 11:59:1615 MR. ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, this is a government 16 exhibit that's on our witness list, and what this is, this is a 17 direct text message exchange between Mr. Constantinescu, Mr. Hrvatin, and others that are in this room today. And Mr. 18 19 -- Mr. Constantinescu -- Mr. Constantinescu's attorney expounded at length about EXPR and how Mr. Constantinescu was just trading 20 EXPR like every other stock that he traded. 21 And so, on January 25th, 2021, he has this exchange 11:59:5122 about EXPR with Mr. Hrvatin. Mr. Constantinescu starts, at the 23 top of the page: (Reading) I sold EXPR around four, but I regret 24 25 it. It has more juice, but I didn't buy back. I rarely ever

buy back. 1 Mr. Hrvatin's response: (Reading) Samesies. Good 12:00:14 shit, dude. 3 Mr. Constantinescu says: (Reading) Why risk it? 12:00:18 4 Mr. Hrvatin says: (Reading) Congrats, Zack. Not 12:00:21 5 worth it. 6 On page 2. Mr. Constantinescu says: (Reading) 12:00:26 7 Thanks, man. 8 Mr. Hrvatin says: (Reading) Why rob the same bank 12:00:30 9 twice? 10 I think that fairly captures what's going on with EXPR 12:00:3411 12 and is real-time evidence about the trading strategy that these 13 defendants were executing at the time. 12:00:5414 So that's just one example just to kind of clear some 15 of the underbrush --12:00:5816 THE COURT: Let's focus on three categories --17 actually, four categories because -- the trading records of the codefendants, the SEC records, the 1099s, and the FBI issue. 18 MR. ARMSTRONG: Sure. So the EXPR example is the 12:01:2019 example of one of the meme stocks that Mr. Constantinescu's 20 attorney just referenced. That's why I brought it up, okay? 21 As to the 1099s, that one's the easiest example first. 12:01:2922 Your Honor, we have produced the trading records and the 23 documents that we have in our possession. The defendants put on 24

their exhibit lists the 1099s that they are seeking a motion to

25

compel about. So, quite frankly, it is lost on me what's going 1 on here with this argument about 1099s. 2 They obviously have them in their possession, and 12:01:49 3 they're on their exhibit lists. So it's mind boggling why we're 4 having this debate about 1099s when they obviously have them, 5 and they plan to introduce them as evidence. 6 THE COURT: Okay. The SEC records? 12:02:02 12:02:06 8 MR. ARMSTRONG: So the analysis that's being glossed over in the extreme is that we only have in our possession 9 information that is part of the prosecution team. 10 12:02:1611 THE COURT: No. Wait, wait. Let's go -- back 12 up, though. When you say "we," who is we? 12:02:2113 MR. ARMSTRONG: The prosecution team, the team sitting 14 in this room. THE COURT: Okay. It's the United States versus these 12:02:2315 16 defendants. If it's in the possession of the United States, 17 it's in your possession. MR. ARMSTRONG: So the analysis is that there's the 12:02:3418 19 prosecution team, and then there are other federal agencies that may or may not be part of the prosecution team, and that is a 20 very fact-intensive --21 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm not recognizing that 12:02:4522 distinction. I'm telling you right now --23 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. 12:02:4824 THE COURT: -- if the United States has exculpatory 12:02:4825

evidence, it owes that to the defendants. 1 MR. ARMSTRONG: So, Your Honor, I understand where 12:02:55 2 you're coming from, but these reports that are being referenced 3 and these reports that are being cited, a lot of them were made 4 before we even had a case that was open, and --5 THE COURT: I understand that, but -- but if -- that's 12:03:08 7 not the issue. The issue is: Is the United States in possession of Brady material? And if it is, it needs to produce 8 it. You can't say, "Well, you know, it's -- I don't have 9 anything in my right pocket because it's all in my left pocket." 10 12:03:3111 MR. ARMSTRONG: So, Your Honor, I certainly 12 appreciate -- I get what you're saying. We don't have that 13 information in our possession. We would have to go ask the SEC for it, which we don't think we, you know, have an obligation to 14 15 do unless ordered to do so --12:03:4716 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm ordering you to do so. 12:03:4917 MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, then that --12:03:5018 THE COURT: Consider that an order. 12:03:5119 MR. ARMSTRONG: Then the devils are in the details on this one because we can't just ask the SEC for documents, you 20 know, that they can't even describe with any certainty in their 21 22 own pleadings. THE COURT: Well, here's the problem, and it's -- I'm 12:04:0223 not saying you're wrong for doing it, but I'm saying it's partly 24 your making, and this is what I'm hearing today. If you're 25

12:05:3719

12:05:4422

12:04:38

going to bring in 397 stocks that aren't related to the indictment -- and I'm not saying I -- I'm going to let you do that, but, I mean, I hear you -- that you're trying to do that -- and you can tell me right now you're not, and that's fine.

But if you are, they're entitled to say, "Wait a minute. That doesn't have anything to do with the price of tea in China." GameStop, you know, went through the roof because there was this underground movement of "stick it to the man," and, you know, people all over the United States, you know, got in on it, you know. And if there is an SEC -- if that's part of your case -- and I'm using that one as an example just because I happen to know about that one. You know, it's what I read in the Wall Street Journal. I don't have any personal knowledge, but -- you know, they're entitled to combat that, and if you've got an SEC investigation that says, you know, these defendants didn't have anything to do with GameStop going through the roof, they're entitled to see that.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, I think we have that
report. I -- I don't -- sitting here today, I have no idea what
the analysis was that --

THE COURT: Well, and I don't know either, but what I hear is you haven't -- you don't -- you've never seen it. I hear the defendants giving somewhat cogent evidence that it exists. Now, some of it may be speculation. Maybe it doesn't

exist. But I'm ordering you to find out if it does, and if it's 1 2 exculpatory, I'm ordering you to produce it. MR. ARMSTRONG: So what are you -- to be on the same 12:06:09 3 page, what are you ordering us to go try to find out? 4 THE COURT: Well, if it's -- if it's -- has to do with 12:06:14 5 any of the stocks in the indictment or it has to do with any of 6 7 these extraneous stocks that you think you're going to offer into evidence. 8 MR. ARMSTRONG: But what is Your Honor asking us to 12:06:28 9 actually ask of the SEC? Because I'm going to get this question 10 11 if I have to ask the SEC. 12:06:3512 THE COURT: Well, I mean, you're going to have to explain Brady to them, to the extent they don't already know 13 14 what Brady material is, and say that the defendants -- the judge 15 says if there's Brady material inside of this -- your 16 investigation, you have to produce it. And so if there's 17 exculpatory evidence, you know, you're going to have to get it from the SEC and give it to the defendants. 18 MR. FORD: Your Honor, if I may interject -- and I 12:07:0319 apologize for interjection. 20 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Would you get to a 12:07:0621 microphone? 22 MR. FORD: This -- what we're looking for is all 12:07:0623 information underlying the SEC's conclusion and analyses in the 24 25 SEC meme stock report, whether prepared before or after DOJ

opened its investigation, including information subpoenaed by 1 2 the SEC from third parties; all information that contradicts the government's allegations in the indictment or the conclusions of 3 its opinion witnesses related to the 19 stock tickers listed, as 4 well as the 397 episodes relied on for the conspiracy; and all 5 information that would otherwise be exculpatory if contained in 6 7 the DOJ's own files, e-mails, phones. THE COURT: Okay. And what I'm ordering is not as 12:07:54 8 broad as what he just read. 9 Because the first request you had, I didn't hear the 12:07:5810 word "exculpatory" -- is to the extent there is Brady material, 11 12 exculpatory material in any of those categories he read, that's what I'm ordering you to produce. 13 12:08:2014 Okay. Trading records of codefendants. 12:08:2415 MR. ARMSTRONG: I think that's the 1099 issue, right, 16 Your Honor? 12:08:2617 THE COURT: Okay. Are there -- I didn't understand. Do you have the trading record -- the actual trading records of 18 the codefendants? 19 MR. ARMSTRONG: Of course. 12:08:3520 THE COURT: And have they been produced? 12:08:3621 12:08:3722 MR. ARMSTRONG: Of course. THE COURT: Okay. All right. 12:08:3823 12:08:4424 MR. ARMSTRONG: And then the third issue, I believe, is the Agent Applegate issue. Is that right, Your Honor? 25

THE COURT: Yes.

12:08:51 1

12:10:3425

12:09:5616

12:08:51

12:09:20

MR. ARMSTRONG: So for this one, I think that the facts are important. Agent Applegate is an agent out of the Texas Bryan station, not the Houston field office where Agent Hale and Agent Dillon work. And Agent Hale and Agent Dillon were the two FBI agents who were the co-leads -- or Agent Dillon was a secondary on this case.

Agent Applegate works primarily on national security issues, and what Agent Hale did was he actually affirmatively put this case in protective status in the FBI's own files. And so what that means is that the file itself was not even viewable to Agent Applegate, and he was not even aware of the investigation into Mr. Constantinescu until, I believe, the day before the arrest when he was given a courtesy that the husband of his sister was going to be arrested.

So the suggestion that Agent Applegate was involved in this case is just not true because we took affirmative steps to wall him off. And so, therefore, what is the analysis under the law? Is the fact that he got \$100,000 Giglio information? No, because he's not a testifying witness in this case. Is it Brady? I think it really strains the concept of Brady to say that his receipt of \$100,000 is somehow Brady information because it doesn't show that Mr. Constantinescu did or did not actually commit the offenses in this case.

It could potentially -- and I think there would be a

12:11:3315

12:11:4218

12:11:4921

12:11:5022

12:11:02

motion in limine on this. It could potentially be used as cross-examination as to other witnesses about their knowledge about whether this fact did or did not happen, but I think that's the extent of that information. I think that the rabbit hole gets run down pretty quickly thinking about other possibilities to shoehorn the fact of this transfer into actually legal cognizable claims.

THE COURT: Okay. Here's what I want to do: As I

THE COURT: Okay. Here's what I want to do: As I said, I'm granting the motion as to the SEC records. I would grant -- or I am granting the motion as to the trading records in the 1099-Bs. I understand, Counsel, that you're telling me that those have already been produced. So that's not a problem, but if they -- if they haven't been, I'm ordering you to produce them.

And it might make things go quicker if you could, you know -- if you have Bates numbers or whatever or tell them what part of the production those are on.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, just to be clear, I -- I'm concerned that we're talking past each other just a little bit on the trading records point.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. ARMSTRONG: We do not have the 1099s in our possession. The defendants have the 1099s in their possession. We have produced, in this case, our -- like, the bank statements, the trading statements, and the trading blotters,

every trading document --1 THE COURT: Okay. But you -- but you don't have the 12:12:02 1099s? 3 MR. ARMSTRONG: Exactly. 12:12:04 4 THE COURT: Okay. Well, y'all can get them from each 12:12:05 5 other. 6 MR. ARMSTRONG: They're on their exhibit lists. 12:12:09 7 THE COURT: So I would strongly suggest that 12:12:11 8 defendants -- but the trading records -- and if you don't have 9 the 1099s, I think just a response in writing that, "We don't 10 have those," suffices. 11 MR. ARMSTRONG: Certainly. 12:12:2512 MS. CORDOVA: Your Honor, if I may just speak on the 12:12:2713 14 1099s. I'm not sure that we do have all of the 1099s even from 15 our --12:12:3316 THE COURT: Well, he's saying he doesn't have them. 12:12:3417 MR. CORDOVA: But the U.S. government does have them. They all have to be filed with the IRS. So he has access to 18 19 them within the U.S. government. We are not in a position, as far as I can tell --12:12:4120 we've looked into this -- to be able to actually go back to the 21 years where those 1099s existed for all of the accounts and 22 collect them ourselves and provide them to defense -- other 23 codefendants' counsel. 24 THE COURT: So you can't get your own 1099s? 12:12:5625

MS. CORDOVA: Not that we're aware of. The government 12:12:59 2 has them. They're in the government's possession. THE COURT: Well, yeah, but the IRS and the 12:13:03 3 4 government... MR. LEWIS: Your Honor, on that point, some of us do 12:13:13 5 have -- for instance, Mr. Cooperman, Webull is the broker trader 6 7 he used. They did provide -- he has them. Many of them, the defendants, such as Mr. Constantinescu with Ameritrade, do not 8 have them. 9 THE COURT: Can -- what's the -- will -- for instance, 12:13:2610 11 will the brokerage house have them? Will Ameritrade have them? 12:13:3312 MR. FORD: That's what I'm proposing. They are on our 13 exhibit list, but we were going to have to Rule 17 them. 14 obtain everybody's, we would have to go to, you know -- I mean, 15 these guys used multiple broker dealers. So the idea was we 16 were -- we put them on the exhibit list with the intent of filing multiple Rule 17 subpoenas to obtain them from the broker 17 dealers. 18 THE COURT: Well, why don't you provide me --12:13:5319 obviously, copying Mr. Armstrong with it -- a subpoena or a 20 draft of what you would like, and -- and we'll -- that way 21 everybody will have them, and, you know -- now, they may not 22 turn out to be exculpatory. They may turn out to be 23 inculpatory, but -- and I think that's the best way to handle 24

that because, otherwise, I mean, you know, what do -- the IRS,

25

what, two weeks ago said they lost, like, 20 billion tax returns 1 2 or something. I mean, getting it from the IRS may -- may be problematic. So let's try it that way. Prepare a subpoena, and 3 the Court will sign that. 4 All right. 12:14:42 5 MR. ROSEN: Your Honor, just to briefly address, while 12:14:45 7 we're here: I know the SEC records have been ordered. We'd ask that the FINRA, a quasi-government agency under the supervision 8 of the SEC, also be ordered to produce those same records. 9 lead government expert, Peter Melley, is a FINRA employee. 10 We've gotten some FINRA productions; we haven't gotten a lot. 11 12 Extraordinarily important.

12:15:0613

12:15:1817

12:15:3723

12:15:4425

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

24

FINRA, when they investigate manipulation or things, they produce a report that often gets sent to the SEC that sometimes travels over to the DOJ, depending on whether criminal involvement.

We got one report, stock UUU. I don't think that's charged here or even in the 397-odd stocks. My client's listed in that as potentially involved, but then they talk about insiders doing actually -- the actual manipulation like a traditional pump-and-dump -- this quy, Mr. Alt (phonetic), who was actually recently charged by the SEC.

So I do ask at least for the 397, as well as for what Mr. Ford raised, that FINRA be ordered to produce that as well.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll include that in my order.

All right. Does -- I think that resolves those 12:15:50 2 issues, Mr. Armstrong. Now, does anybody else have a -- an issue that 12:15:57 3 involves discovery that we haven't covered? 4 MS. SOLANO: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I just didn't 12:16:05 5 hear what Your Honor's ruling is on the -- the exculpatory data 6 7 involving the testifying agent's potentially missing the \$100,000 --8 THE COURT: I'm going to actually take that up 12:16:15 9 10 separately. 12:16:1811 MS. SOLANO: Thank you, Your Honor. 12:16:2012 MR. ROSEN: There's one other issue that just relates 13 to us. We've gotten E-Trade records from -- from the 14 government. It's a little bit weird because they only go back a 15 year, actually, the paper copies; the statements. We have these 16 massive spreadsheets that are the trade -- the actual trades. 17 There's, like -- they're, like, 25 megabytes each. They're 18 enormous. And so just a little odd that we haven't gotten the 12:16:4119 actual paper statements. I just ask for the government to go 20 back and just make sure those weren't produced by E-Trade 21 because, usually, they give you -- if you do a subpoena to them, 22 they give you a couple years' worth of trading data. We've only 23 gotten the one year. So I just wanted to raise that issue. 24 THE COURT: Would you just check and see if you have

12:16:5625

the paper? 1 MR. ARMSTRONG: Of course. 12:16:59 THE COURT: All right. 12:16:59 3 MS. CORDOVA: Your Honor, we also have a motion to 12:17:00 compel a -- witness statements, and the issue is that the 5 government has taken a categorical approach to saying they will 6 7 not produce any testifying witness's e-mail that discusses the search warrant, seizure warrant, any -- any affidavits or expert 8 reports except for the final signed magistrate judge-approved 9 version or in the expert report -- expert-signed version. 10 Now, that's an extraordinary position, in my 12:17:2911 12 experience, for the government to take. We're not saying that every e-mail sent between the testifying agent or an expert and 13 14 the prosecution is a Jenks-qualified witness statement, but to 15 take a categorical approach that, "We will not be producing any 16 of these materials," is inappropriate and contrary to the law. 12:17:5317 And, therefore, we've asked for in camera review of those materials so that Your Honor can determine which documents 18 19 are, in fact, witness statements that should be produced. THE COURT: Okay. Let me take that up with the FBI 12:18:0220 issue. 21 All right. I tell you what, why don't we take a 10-12:18:1122 or 15-minute stretch break. Come back at 12:30, and I'm going 23 to go through these motions. 24

12:18:2225

(Recess taken from 12:18 p.m. to 12:36 p.m.)

12:36:15 1 **THE CO**

12:36:21

12:37:22

12:39:5223

12:39:5825

12:39:1316

THE COURT: All right. Be seated.

Okay. All right. By my count, we have addressed the Brady motions with one exception. I haven't ruled yet on the trial setting, but we do have some individual motions from various -- Mr. Rybarczyk has filed an opposed motion to exclude the 397 episodes, which the government has not had time to respond to. So I'm going to let the government respond to that.

He's also filed, if I'm finding it in the right place, a joint motion to dismiss, which is -- again, the government has not had time to respond to that. So I'm going to let the government respond to that, although I -- I would point out, I mean, basically, it's based on both the Fifth Circuit law and the Supreme Court law that holds you've got to have an actual loss of property, that losing something intangible is not subject to a fraud claim.

I will say that both the Supreme Court case, which

Justice Thomas wrote, and the leading Fifth Circuit case, which

I think Judge Stewart wrote, if I'm right and my memory serves

me here -- yeah -- both indicate that if you are deceiving

others to obtain something of value, that's also actionable.

And so I'm going to wait and rule on those when the government responds.

Mr. Armstrong, is ten days enough to respond to those two motions?

MR. ARMSTRONG: The extraneous 397 and the motion to

dismiss? 1 THE COURT: Yeah. 12:40:02 2 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. Of course. 12:40:02 3 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So you have ten days to 12:40:03 4 respond to that. 5 I have a -- a motion that is still showing as pending, 12:40:11 6 7 which was Mr. Hennessey's first motion to dismiss, and I'm denying that. 8 And I guess, Ms. Cordova, is there a second set of 12:40:30 9 motions -- there's the -- was the first one. Is that -- and 10 then there's one that addressed counts 8, 9, and 11? 11 MS. CORDOVA: That was the first one. The 8, 9, and 12:40:4812 11 motion to dismiss was the first motion. 13 12:40:5314 THE COURT: All right. That's -- I'm denying that one. And is there a second one? 15 MS. CORDOVA: We filed that with the other motions to 12:40:5616 17 dismiss. So there was the 8, 9, and 11, which we filed first right after the superseding indictment came out. Then we filed 18 our big motion to dismiss later. 19 12:41:0520 THE COURT: Okay. So I'm denying the 8, 9, and 11 motion to dismiss. 21 I'm trying to look and see what other issues we've got 12:41:1322 23 pending. I think I've covered everything until we get to the 12:41:3024 25 motion for continuance, and I'm -- I'm denying the motion --

12:42:3711

12:43:0316

12:43:2321

12:41:50

Mr. Hennessey's motion to sever. I'm granting the alternative plea in that motion to sever as well as the other motions for continuance.

And while I know, Ms. Cordova, your client would have preferred to go to trial six weeks ago -- six months ago, maybe -- and so I probably know your answer, I'm -- there are two -- I have two windows to try this, and -- and I have, basically, February and April. And I want some feedback from y'all, and I know, you know, everybody's going to have scheduling, but we're just going to have to declare one of them.

But part of the issue in this is how long this trial's going to take. And since we're all here, I want to talk about that because, you know, I've looked at the witness designations and some people have designated 40 or 50 witnesses; 10,000 exhibits. I mean, what are we realistically talking about?

And I understand that sometimes you designate individuals in kind of a CYA fashion, "In case, you know, the sun rises in the west, I may have to put this person on." But realistically -- and, Mr. Armstrong, let me -- let me start with you.

I mean -- and keep in mind that my number one concern -- obviously, I want y'all to get a fair trial. That's number one, but I also -- 1A is we're going to have to pick a jury, and we're going to have to have that jury, you know, go through all this and listen to all this, and I don't -- I keep

12:45:0016

12:45:2120

12:45:2722

12:44:06

looking at this, and I can't see -- I understand the issues with discovery, but I can't see why we're going to have big issues in trying the case.

And maybe it's just me, and maybe it's the way I used to try cases and I'm imputing that to y'all, but, I mean, none of these -- no juror's going to look at 10,000 exhibits from one party in a -- in an eight-party case. I mean, what's -- realistically is going to happen is the government's going to put on its case, and each defendant is going to say -- and part of the case, I would imagine, would be cross-examination by the defendant saying, "Well, I see where you picked this one, and you picked this one, but you left out, you know, all these communications between them, and, oh, by the way, they -- they declared a stock dividend in the middle of this, and their stock went through the roof because of this dividend."

I mean, I can see all that, but I can't see this case being drug out -- somebody mentioned the *Enron* case, which, of course, is a four-letter word here, not a five. But I can't see why it would be tried that way.

I mean, to me, it would be short, sweet. Here's the deal from the government's standpoint.

And from y'all, from the defense standpoint, it would be, you know, this would be -- the government would be right if this is all you looked at, but what about all this, you know.

They didn't count A. They didn't count B. They didn't count C,

You know, they omitted two hours' worth of trades or

you know. 1 12:45:43 two hours' worth of back and forth. I mean, realistically --3 and, Mr. Armstrong, we'll start with you. I mean, how long do 4 you think the government's going to take to put on its case? 5 12:46:06 7 and answer, question and answer from the United States? 12:46:11 8

MR. ARMSTRONG: If we're talking purely about question

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Two weeks.

THE COURT: Why is it going to take that long? And I realize we have seven defendants. So, I mean, I realize that.

MR. ARMSTRONG: So just running through --

THE COURT: A lot of the defendants are cross- -- I mean, they're cross charged.

MR. ARMSTRONG: So just running through the witness list in my head, we would have the data expert, for lack of a better word, Ms. Garibotti. She would talk about the process that went into making the charts, which are compelling evidence in this case. That would probably be three-quarters of a day to a day.

Then we would have two cooperators in this case, probably a day for each, just question and answer, question and answer. Then we would have a whistleblower in this case, half a day. The case agent, half a day.

Then we would have the victims in this case to prove

11

12:46:2012

12:46:12 9

12:46:1410

12:46:2213

14

16

12:46:2615

17

18

19 20

12:46:4421

23

22

24

12:46:5925

12:48:0519

12:48:1421

12:47:16

12:47:3310

up the materiality point. There are a lot of substantive counts that are charged, and so we have in the ballpark neighborhood of 10 to 15, I believe, victims, but those are fast witnesses. I think that -
THE COURT: And what are they going to testify, that

"I looked at this Twitter feed, thought it was a great stock, and I bought it, and I lost my shirt because I listened to the Twitter feed"? I mean, what are the -- kind of tell me what a victim's going to say.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Sure. So they'll say -- all the stories are different, of course, depending on who followed whom at what point. But in the main, they would say, "I followed defendant A on Twitter. I trusted him. I believed that he knew what he was doing. If I had known that he was selling at the same time he was telling the world to buy or to hold, that would have been important to my decision to buy the stock in the first place. And so because I was deceived, because I was misled by the defendant's statements, I was, therefore, harmed."

THE COURT: Okay. And how do you see these 397 uncharged episodes coming in?

MR. ARMSTRONG: So as we said in -- at this point, I forgot which response it was. There's no universe in which we're going into 397 at all. I thought that we tried to narrow the issues a little bit and represent to the defendants that we would seek to offer affirmative evidence as to the first 45

episodes that are GX1 through 45 with some sub exhibits.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

12:49:1011

12:49:2213

12:49:2614

12:49:2815

12:49:4419

12:50:0425

12:48:40

So that would be the -- in the main, the universe that we'd offer at trial, and then we'd have to go back -- and I thought about doing this last night, go back and see which other episodes we would add to the actual trial presentation. I think that there are a few, off the top of my head, that match up text messages that are otherwise exhibits. And so we'd probably include those, as well, as part of the trial presentation, but there's no universe in which we're going over 100, 200, or even 300.

The point of those is just to explain the methodology that fed into Ms. Garibotti's ultimate profit amount.

THE COURT: And why does that matter?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Why does what matter, Your Honor?

THE COURT: How much money they made. I mean, if they committed fraud, they're guilty. If they didn't commit fraud, they're not guilty. And whether it's fraud for \$10 or fraud for 100,000,000, what difference does it make to the jury?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I think it goes squarely to motive, to explain why they were doing this, and it goes to their intent, because it was extremely profitable to trade in this manner and hold themselves out as A, when, in fact, they were doing B. And so it explains why they had skin in the game to act in the way that they did.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm going to let you

respond to the motion that Rybarczyk filed to exclude those, but 1 2 I'm telling you right now I'm thinking that's a hard row for you to hoe. I mean, I'm not seeing that, especially from a legal 3 standpoint, but I'm also seeing it from a practical standpoint. 4 I mean, the minute you introduce that, I'm going to 12:50:26 5 get one of the defense lawyers to stand up and say, "Well, let's 6 7 go through the facts of that one," and -- and we're trying an uncharged case by that point. And -- and so keep in mind you're 8 going to need to do some convincing when you reply to that 9 10 motion.

12:50:5611

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

12:51:2319

12:51:3123

12:51:3224

12:51:3825

MR. ARMSTRONG: So I totally hear Your Honor on the practical standpoint. Again, just to underscore, we're not getting into anywhere close to the 397. I think the three -- the 1 through 45 we are absolutely going to do because a lot of those have contemporaneous text messages and otherwise direct messages between the defendants and show the concert of action and show the conspiracy in action, show them coordinating behind the scenes to do exactly what we are --

THE COURT: Well, of course -- and I haven't seen it. So I don't know what they show, but, I mean, that's the kind of thing you're going to have to tell me about, why that would be relevant.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Certainly.

THE COURT: All right.

Who wants to lead off, talk to me about -- the defense

1 lawyers, what do you -- thinking time-wise? I mean, the way I'm looking at this is we've got to try this in a month. I mean, 2 we'll be lucky to have a jury for that long. 3 MR. FORD: I tend to agree with you on that, but I 12:51:55 think the issues --5 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Microphone. 12:51:58 12:52:02 THE COURT: It's -- yeah, get near a microphone. 7 MR. FORD: I tend to agree. We would -- we prefer to 12:52:04 move as quickly as possible to keep the jury's attention. 9 issue, as we see it from the defense perspective, is the way the 10 government is choosing to prosecute this case. All of their 11 12 exhibits are not actual evidence, but summary charts, and they're going to attempt to try this case through experts, 13 specifically people with relationships to the Securities and 14 Exchange Commission, FINRA. And they're going to bring them in, 15 and they're going to have experts who are going to say, "Hey, 16 17 look at these summary charts we made. These guys committed fraud." 18 12:52:3719 The defense to that is going to be to have to unpack it, and I think that -- and I'm not joking. I think two years 20 would be a conservative estimate for trying to unpack what the 21 government is attempting to prove. As Mr. Rosen, my colleague, 22 said, who also has a lot of experience with this, with a case 23 where there's been charged two, three, four pump-and-dumps, 24

we're oftentimes looking at a several-month-long trial, maybe

25

two months, three months.

12:54:0422

12:53:4415

12:53:03

12:53:21

So I think the nature in which the government is doing it is one issue. The other really very big issue is this causation thing. The government has got to take an affirmative stance on whether they're arguing causation. They either are or they aren't.

If they're not going to argue causation, I tend to agree with Your Honor. I think we could potentially do this in a month, but if they're going to argue causation, we need to be presented the opportunity to come in and say, no, the price fluctuations, the price movements, these guys had nothing to do with that. There were other factors and variables that caused it, in which case, again, now we're talking about a multi-month endeavor.

As far as February or April, our vote would be for April. Our team -- and I understand all the other teams are prioritizing this case. We understand the significance of -- and importance. We're not going to be able to coordinate the scheduling of 20, 25 attorneys. So I think, when we walk away, if we say April, we're all going to clear it and be ready to do it.

But that's our position as far as why it's taking so long. I think -- I do think a month is a conservative estimate if they're going to push on the causation and their case is primarily going to be built around having SEC and FINRA experts

12:54:5912

12:55:2917

12:54:25

testify about charts that they made. That's going to take an awful lot of time for each of the codefendants' attorneys to unpack.

THE COURT: Let me -- let me mention one thing about that, and it's kind of a little off track from what you just said, but there was one motion -- or notice, I think, that basically said, All right, government, I'm going to make you authenticate everything, and here's -- here's what I -- I don't want to have happen -- and, I mean, if there is some real question about whether a summary is an actual summary, I mean, obviously, that's fair game.

But I don't want to have to have a business records person get up here and answer the -- you know, take an hour of testimony just to say these are business records. I don't want to have to go through with a witness and say, "Okay. Where is this in the file," when everybody knows it's in the file.

Now, having said that, as I said a minute ago, I think it's fair game to say, "Fine. You picked this from September 3rd and this from September 5th, but look at what happened on September 4th." That's clearly fair game and -- and good cross-examination, but -- but I don't want to get this trial tied down, when we have important merits to talk about, on something that -- that, quite frankly, y'all should be able to agree on, you know, like, okay, here are the TD -- what is TD trading called? I can't even remember anymore.

12:56:13 1

12:56:15 2

12:56:16 3

6

7

5

12:56:32 8

10

9

12

13

14

16

12:56:5915

17

12:57:0718

12:57:0819

20

21

22

12:57:2623

24

25

MR. FORD: TD Ameritrade.

THE COURT: TD Ameritrade.

I mean, these are their records. Okay. We don't have to have somebody from them come down here and say, "Was this kept in the regular course of business? Was it made be somebody at the time?" You know, all that kind of stuff, I don't want to do that because this trial's going to be long anyway.

I'm probably going to -- I haven't thought about how

I'd do it, although I was getting ready to given the October

trial setting. I'm probably going to do a timing order on

everybody. And in that regard, with regard to the defendants -
and it's -- I don't think it's necessarily unfair, but if

somebody's already plowed a row, I don't want somebody to come

back and plow that same row, you know.

I mean, sometimes the best cross-examination is to stand up and say, you know, "Did you see my client's name anywhere on that?"

"No."

"Thank you." Sit down, I mean, you know, and let the people that have the dog in the fight on Count 2 or Count 3 make -- you know, fight that fight. They won't need everybody else to help fight it.

And what I'm -- I mean, since I am going to grant a continuance, I'm -- I'm just fleshing this out for y'all because I want y'all to really take into consideration how we're going

to present this because it's going to take a lot of work.

12:59:3124

12:58:4015

12:57:43

One thing I think y'all should consider -- and I'm not ordering it, but I would think quite helpful, because I'm going to do the voir dire, that y'all might want to get together and do a joint jury questionnaire. And what we'll do, and what we've done in the past, is we bring the jury in, let's say, on Thursday or Friday, have them answer the questionnaire, and Rhonda speedily copies the answers for everybody and gets them out to you so you have two or three days to look at it before we actually get the jury in here. I mean, you know, it's -- that's a lot -- in my experience, that's a lot better than saying, okay, here's the answer to the questionnaire, now start questioning, you know. You know, so you'll have a time to look at it; time to do it.

What I normally do is I will do the voir dire generally, but then if there are any individual jurors that people have questions about, we'll bring them in privately outside the presence of the other jurors, and that way we won't taint the panel if we're -- you know, somebody gets up and says, you know, "I hate the government," you know, "I grew up on Ruby Ridge, and then I moved to Waco for the" -- for that episode.

And so, you know -- but -- but so I want to -- I want y'all to be thinking about how we're going to do this.

I mean, I'm -- quite frankly, I'll tell you right now, I'm worried about where we're going to do it because I'm not

13:00:5118

13:01:1524

13:00:2511

12:59:50

sure this courtroom is big enough. So I may be negotiating with Judge Hoyt or Judge Rosenthal to use one of the bigger courtrooms to do this.

But I -- what I really want is a crisp presentation where -- it's been my experience, and I've had several long trials, that, you know, most of the prospective jurors are going to do their best to get out of jury duty, but once they're picked, they do their best to do their civic duty. And once they're on the jury, they're going to do the right thing, but they hate it when lawyers waste their time.

I mean, you know, they hate it when they're unprepared. They hate it when they're just asking the same question over and over again, and, quite frankly, usually they penalize that lawyer's client eventually. So I want y'all to keep in mind -- and I'm giving you now three or four months to consider how are we going to present this case in a concise manner.

Obviously, you want to protect your clients.

Obviously, the government's trying to get a conviction, and that's fine to represent your sides of the "V." That's expected. But, you know, how do you make it short and sweet and impactful for your side where the jury is not just beat up for a month?

Anyway -- all right. I'm -- I'm going to designate April as the month.

Go ahead. You want to weigh in?

13:01:19

13:01:23

13:01:4310

13:02:0416

13:02:2422

MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, I had a suggestion. Some of the things -- I think you may have our office bugged because some of the things you mentioned are things that we've actually talked about. Joint questionnaire, I don't think anybody in this room's going to disagree with that. We can come up with one we could present to the government. In my experience, they help both parties exercise their peremptories and, to some extent, their challenges for cause.

I agree I think we should explore -- having tried, with Laura, years -- almost ten years ago, an almost-as-large case in Judge Gilmore's courtroom that took, I think, the first six or seven weeks of my youngest child's life, literally.

Like, she was born; we got a week continuance for that; and then we started trial. My wife still hates me over it.

I think it's challenging to do it on the ninth floor.

I think the 11th, if we could somehow orchestrate that, would be great. I think that we should have a robust pretrial hearing around the Ides of March, not so we can stab each other like the Roman Senate, but so that we can hash out some of these issues over summary charts.

I agree 902(11), 803(6), business records issues, I'm not here to deal with that. That's -- that's beneath everybody in this room. I think the Fifth Circuit precedent is so flexible in that regard, we don't need to waste time with that,

13:03:4019

13:03:0910

13:02:47

but there may be very real questions that, if we address sufficiently in advance of an April setting, may streamline the process.

But the number one consideration that I would express is that the length of the trial -- and Your Honor has the procedures and the right, under Rule 611 of the federal rules, to address the presentation and the mode of questioning to avoid the waste of time or pettiness and that sort of thing. I think that's actually in my motion.

But the length of this trial is going to be directly proportional to the number of stocks the government presents evidence on. So that's -- that's the elephant in the room. If it's the 19 stocks in the indictment, then it's a short trial because I'm not going to be asking questions about 19 stocks, because Mr. Rybarczyk isn't affected by 19 stocks. So I may not have questions or my colleagues on our team may not have questions of a bunch of the witnesses because they're not about Mr. Rybarczyk.

So, for me, that's really a handful of stocks. So 19 in the aggregate, a few per defendant, is -- will dictate the length of the trial because there's no need for seven defense lawyers to question a witness who doesn't lay a hand or doesn't express anything about their client, and Your Honor doesn't have to worry about extraneous information of another, call it 26 of -- of they say 45. Gee, thanks. There's only 19 in the

indictment -- of an additional 26 tickers, let alone another 350-odd.

13:05:0116

13:05:0919

13:04:18

13:04:30

13:04:38

So if we can do this trial from around Tax Day to when I usually go on vacation in June, because I'm selfish, the -- I think we can do that --

THE COURT: Notice how he went from a month to six weeks? He just slid right into that.

MR. WILLIAMS: Look, if we could do it between April and Memorial Day, I think, with the 19 -- because there are seven defendants, Your Honor. And I could tell you, oh, we could do it in X, but I've known how long I've taken to cross-examine an important witness, and not to waste time, but just to do it thoroughly and effectively, and I -- Mr. Lewis doesn't appear to be here, but I've seen him in action. I've tried cases with Laura.

I've seen at least half of the lawyers in this room in action. I have a lot of respect for them, and I don't think any of them usually wastes anybody's time in their questioning.

So the -- but, again, it's going to be tied to how many stocks are we dealing with. The government has 19 chances to prove a conspiracy in a fraud. If they can't get it done with 19, 45 is -- I mean, it's just piling on. It's there, and as Your Honor pointed out -- and it's in our motion, and I know they'll have time to respond to it -- loss is an issue for the Court to consider, as is restitution post conviction.

So if we can deal with motions in limine, like I said, 2 sometime in March because, based on those rulings, people may 3 need to amend their exhibit lists, tailor their cross-examinations, and if we do that the day before voir dire, 4 it doesn't really help people. If we do it a month out, then it 5 may actually help streamline the case. 6 So those are my suggestions and my observation, that 13:06:00 7 it's just going to be tied to how many stocks are at issue, 8 9 although I know the government needs time to weigh in on my 10 motion, as do others. THE COURT: Okay. All right. 13:06:0911 MR. ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, if I may? 13:06:1212 13:06:1313 THE COURT: Yeah. Go ahead. 13:06:1414 MR. ARMSTRONG: So I hear Your Honor on scheduling for 15 next year. My only concern is that, given Your Honor's order about both FINRA and the SEC, we are, to some extent, beholden 16 17 to bureaucracies --THE COURT: And you may need to report back to me --13:06:3418 13:06:3619 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. 13:06:3620 THE COURT: -- and say, "Judge, this is a bigger deal than you thought it was." 21 MR. ARMSTRONG: I can guarantee you that's going to be 13:06:4122 the case, Your Honor, because I've dealt with these 23 24 bureaucracies before, and it's nearly impossible, and things that you think could take a week take 12 weeks just on the most 25

basic, fundamental issues. 1 THE COURT: Well, and we may have to change. We may 13:06:53 2 have to -- we may have to move. April may not work, but I'm 3 hoping it will. I'm trying to be realistic, which is why I 4 didn't take February. 5 MR. ARMSTRONG: So I -- I have one suggestion for 13:07:04 7 Your Honor. I think Your Honor -- I may stand corrected. I think Your Honor said that we need to make the request to the 8 SEC and FINRA as to all 397. Did I hear you right? 9 So if Your Honor is inclined to limit our proof at 13:07:1810 trial to a more discrete set of episodes, I think that would go 11 12 a long way in, fingers crossed, helping speed along our request to --13 13:07:3614 THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure --13:07:3715 MR. ARMSTRONG: -- either of these agencies. 13:07:3816 THE COURT: I'm not sure that I'm in a position to do 17 that. You're actually in the better position. If you want to -- if you want to limit it to the 45 that you've already 18 19 figured out that these are the most relevant, but the -- the key here, though, is that if -- if it's exculpatory, they get it. 20 MR. ARMSTRONG: Understood. I --13:08:0221 THE COURT: I don't want to try this twice. It's 13:08:0422 going to be hard enough to try once. 23 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. And I understand Your Honor's 13:08:0824 ruling, and I'm not going to guibble with it. So we'll do our 25

darndest, of course. 1 THE COURT: Okay. Let me -- I want to visit with 13:08:21 Mr. Constantinescu's lawyers and the government over that third 3 motion and the FBI issue because I -- it's -- it's his 4 brother-in-law, right, that's the FBI agent? 5 MS. SOLANO: (Nods head.) 13:08:50 13:08:53 7 THE COURT: Let me see y'all up here. 13:09:05 8 (Discussion at bench as follows with Mr. Armstrong, 9 Ms. Solano, and Mr. Ford.) THE COURT: Not on the FBI issue, but on the 13:09:1610 conversations with the lawyer issue, I've seen some of those 11 12 communications. So far -- and I don't know how much of it I've 13 seen. I don't think there's anything exculpatory in there. 14 fact, it's inculpatory. 13:09:4115 I mean, there's -- and maybe we want to talk this --16 just go -- I don't know how much of it you gave me or how much 17 you have other stuff. I mean, it -- just to be blunt, the government made -- made a motion to -- for me to, basically, 18 take him into custody based on some of the comments he made, 19 which I obviously didn't grant. 20 But there is -- I mean, there's some testimony on --13:10:1121 evidence -- "testimony," obviously, that -- that is not very 22 flattering in that third motion. Now, I don't -- we can discuss 23 it in open court; we can go into chambers and talk about it. 24 You know what I'm talking about, I guess -- or maybe Mr. Carter 25

does.

13:11:3422

13:11:0714

13:10:35

13:10:38

13:10:38

MR. FORD: So, Your Honor, if I just -- to parse
through it --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. If you could speak into that microphone (indicating) there.

MR. FORD: So just to parse through it, we've got the two issues. So we put in and we find out two things, one about the brother-in-law and the transfer of the \$100,000. Obviously, there's a marital dispute happening here. We find out that one of the AUSAs goes and talks, and what we've -- the reason we view it as an exculpatory statement is one Kyles v. Whitley, which said if there's any doubt about the investigation, that's fair game.

Now, is that going to be my trial strategy? Don't know, but I'm entitled to at least look at it -- and, two, these sort of contradictory positions where on the one hand they're saying he made \$89, and the other hand they're saying he gave that money to the brother-in-law FBI agent sister. That is a little strange. We just -- normally, when you rob the bank and steal the gold bars, the government doesn't ask we give them to the FBI's agent's sister. So that was that.

We've heard, then, the response of the government well, hey, he should go to jail for trying to get this Brady material. What has happened, you know, they lived apart for some time now in separate houses, obviously really struggling

with money. My client is dating somebody. He's in a 1 2 relationship. She went out of town to France. They were hanging 13:11:51 3 out, the soon to be ex-wife, going to the bar, you know, hanging 4 5 out; go -- spending time together. When the girlfriend got back, I think she got very upset. And so at least some of what 6 7 then transpired were through these text message communications that we have a couple things. 8 We have all of their text message correspondence 13:12:11 9 between Mr. Constantinescu and his wife, as well as eyewitness 10 testimony that whatever was happening, you know, it wasn't 11 12 contentious. I think they were actually really enjoying one 13 another's company. 13:12:2514 That said, it leads into another thing that we have outstanding, which is the money issue that my client is 15 suffering. I don't want to make this a sort of family law 16 17 issue. He wants to be supporting his wife. He has for a long time --18 13:12:3719 THE COURT: Well, I think you made a motion to -- to sell certain property, and the government has come back, 20 basically, and said, "We're okay with everything but the 21 22 Bentwater house." MR. ARMSTRONG: Yep. That's correct. 13:12:4723 13:12:4824 THE COURT: All right. And so I'm granting that --

MR. FORD: Okay.

13:12:5025

THE COURT: -- in hopes that helps ease that pain. 13:12:51 1 13:12:59 MS. SOLANO: Your Honor, can I ask, just so I 2 understand: You said you had something ex parte that was 3 unflattering. Were they conversations between the divorce 4 attorney and the AUSA, or were they --5 THE COURT: It was with the wife --13:13:10 6 13:13:13 7 MS. SOLANO: Okay. THE COURT: -- recounting conversations with your 13:13:13 8 9 client. MR. FORD: Through the 302, yeah. I mean, that's the 13:13:1610 sort of thing that -- and I don't think we need to burden you, 11 12 if you're not interested, but the text message chain, it sounds as exactly what I described. Like, two people who were hanging 13 out while the girlfriend was away, and then the wife [sic] got 14 15 very angry when she came back into town. So I'll just leave it 16 at that. So I don't think we need to go down the road, if 17 you're not concerned. THE COURT: Yeah. I don't think it -- I mean, I'm 13:13:3718 19 just telling you I don't think it's dirty laundry you need to air, necessarily, and I'm not going to allow it into evidence, 20 but I can promise you, at least as far as what I've seen, there 21 wasn't anything exculpatory. If anything, it was inculpatory. 22 MS. SOLANO: So what we were trying to accomplish and 13:13:5423 make sure of is our understanding -- and we weren't a party to 24

those conversations, and we don't think that they were

25

memorialized, with the exception of certain e-mails, is in the 1 2 event that the AUSA was telling the defense attorney on -- or, I'm sorry, the divorce attorney anything related to our client's 3 assets, his availability of those assets to a third party --4 THE COURT: I've seen nothing on that, and I don't 13:14:23 5 know if it exists or not. 6 7 MR. ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, I believe that we attached 13:14:27 the relevant e-mails to our response, and you can ask 8 Mr. Carter. He was the one who discussed this with the divorce 9 attorney. But we also stand by our briefings and stand by the 10 communications that we attached to our --11 THE COURT: Have they seen it? Have they seen the 13:14:4112 13 communications? 13:14:4414 MR. ARMSTRONG: I believe so. They were filed as part 15 of our response. 13:14:4616 THE COURT: Okay. 13:14:4717 MS. SOLANO: So, so long as -- because obviously, right, Brady includes things that are not just in e-mail, right? 18 19 So to the extent the AUSA had a conversation that he didn't memorialize, right, because he's not an FBI agent, it wouldn't 20 be normal for him to write a report on something like that. If 21 the AUSA had any conversations with the divorce attorney where 22 he was talking about our client's assets or the availability of 23 our assets, we would just ask that the substance of that 24

conversation be provided to us as Brady.

25

THE COURT: I don't see how it's Brady either. 13:15:20 1 13:15:22 MS. SOLANO: So I think we think it's Brady because if the AUSA is telling a third party that it's fine for that third 3 party to have \$10,000 a month of Constantinescu's assets when, 4 simultaneously, the government -- and particularly on count 5 21 -- is saying that -- that all of his money is dirty money, 6 7 it's forfeitable, it's money laundering, we would respectfully say that those are inconsistent positions, and it cuts against 8 the argument that the government thinks that all of his money is 9 the result of fraud. 10 THE COURT: Okay. I'm not seeing that, but -- but --13:15:5611 12 here's what I'm going to do: Set aside your -- what you filed on your motion; file me a direct brief saying, "Here's what we 13 14 want concerning the FBI, and here's what we want," and then you 15 guys respond to it --13:16:2016 THE REPORTER: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I'm having a hard time hearing you with all of the --17 13:16:2018 (To the open court as follows.) 13:16:3019 THE COURT: Can y'all hold it down? (Discussion at the bench continued as follows.) 13:16:3020 13:16:3021 THE COURT: You know, take ten days. You take ten days to respond to it. I mean, the response is, "Look, it 22 didn't happen." That's great. I mean, that -- that eases their 23 pain, and if it's -- the response is, "Well, it may have 24 happened, but we don't think it's Brady," then just do that. 25

Let's find that out. And the same thing with the FBI. 1 Now, let me emphasize to all concerned here that I am 13:16:53 2 a judge from the civil side of things. So I'm kind of allowing 3 4 discovery on the one hand, as you heard today, but just because it's discovery doesn't mean it's admissible, and just -- you 5 know, so I'm not -- you're going to maybe have to do some 6 7 convincing to me that that ever comes into evidence on something, but -- but -- so you guys just file a straightforward 8 motion --9 MS. SOLANO: Yes, Your Honor. 13:17:2910 THE COURT: -- and -- and you file a straightforward 13:17:3011 12 response, and I'll deal with that -- those two issues 13 separately. 13:17:3814 But -- and -- because I have not focused on the 15 attorneys talking and why that would be Brady because -- quite 16 frankly, one thing you better put in your motion is explain to 17 me how that's Brady because, right now, I'm not seeing it. MS. SOLANO: Yes, Your Honor. We'll make sure. 13:17:5418 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. 13:17:5619 13:18:0020 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you Judge. MS. SOLANO: Thank you, Your Honor. 13:18:0121 (End of discussion at bench.) 13:18:0222 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to issue a new 13:18:1223 24 scheduling order. I am going to set aside days probably in late 25 March. I may try to -- I don't know how -- you know, I'm so old 13:19:4822

13:19:5825

13:19:1213

13:18:41

I don't worry about spring break, but I may try to work around the fact that some of y'all may have spring break and kids that you need to attend to. But I'll try to work around the two major spring -- weeks of spring break, but I'll probably hold a couple days' worth of hearings.

Keep in mind I want to preadmit everything. So, I mean, when we start the trial, I don't want to have fights over evidence. I want to have those fights resolved because that will speed things up, especially if, you know -- I mean, you think a jury hates you wasting time, when you have to get up and kick them out of the courtroom and bring them back in three or four times, you know, they really hate that.

So plan on -- and when you get the order, you'll see it. It'll probably give you a date, but that -- that may be a couple days' worth of hearings, and, you know, you may want to plan your staffing. If you've got somebody that knows, you know, about the case, but there's somebody else that really knows about the exhibits, you know, it's -- that latter person may be the most important person -- the person that actually knows about the documents or knows about the issues will be the one that you may want at that hearing.

All right. I will issue that order. Is there any pertinent motion, or any motion at all, that we haven't talked about?

Go ahead, Mr. Armstrong.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, just one very discrete 13:20:01 2 issue to raise right now. This is an issue raised by Mr. Lewis. 3 He represented, in a document that was presented to the Court, that Mr. Cooperman has in his possession documents and 4 information that is relevant to this case, and we have made 5 numerous reciprocal discovery requests of all the defendants, 6 7 and to date we have not received anything in response. So, obviously, if they're sitting on material that's 13:20:25 8 important and that is potentially relevant, we would ask that 9 that information be produced to us by a date certain. 10 THE COURT: Who tagged in for Mr. Lewis? 13:20:3311 MR. ZADEH: Sina Zadeh, Your Honor. 13:20:3912 13:20:4113 THE COURT: All right. Talk to him, and what I want 14 is I want that produced by the end of the month to the 15 government. 13:20:4716 MR. ARMSTRONG: Does that apply to all defendants, 17 Your Honor? THE COURT: Yeah. 13:20:4918 13:20:4919 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you. 13:20:4920 THE COURT: If anybody owes the government discovery, let's try to get it to them by the end of the month. 21 13:20:5522 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you. 13:20:5523 MR. ZADEH: Yes, Your Honor. 13:20:5624 MS. CORDOVA: Your Honor, we had a motion to compel 25 pending. I don't know if you're going to take that up today.

We just mentioned it earlier, the witness statements. The 1 government has done a blanket denial of producing those. 2 THE COURT: Tell me: What statements -- are you 13:21:06 3 trying to make them create a statement? 4 MS. CORDOVA: No, no, Your Honor. These are e-mails 13:21:12 5 by the case agent and the expert witness that are Jencks 6 7 material because they relate to the substance of their testimony, and the government has taken the position that any 8 e-mail that is not a -- attaching a final draft affidavit is not 9 a witness statement under Jenks and, therefore, not producible. 10 The way we read the law, it is a question of is that 13:21:3611 12 person, is that their -- is it a statement? 13:21:4313 We're not saying every e-mail ever sent by the 14 testifying agent or the expert witness is Jenks, but what we're 15 saying is it is completely beyond comprehension that there would 16 not be any e-mails about the expert reports; about the 17 affidavits in this case that are not, in fact, Jenks, and we ask for production of those materials. 18 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Armstrong, have you 13:22:0219 20 replied to that? 13:22:0521 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes. THE COURT: Because I'm not familiar with it. I'll 13:22:0522 have to study up on that one. 23 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor. We actually filed 13:22:0824 25 the law that a draft of a, for example, search warrant, or a

draft of an expert report is not Jencks because it is not the 1 2 final statement that has been approved or adopted by the actual witness. That's why we have disclosures, so that you can 3 actually have the actual statement of the witness as the final 4 copy, and that's the statement. 5 THE COURT: Let me look at that issue. I'm not 13:22:30 7 prepared to rule on that. MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Judge. 13:22:34 8 MS. CORDOVA: And, Your Honor, one other thing, just 13:22:35 9 for the record. We'll note that we object to the continuance, 10 and we would ask for the earlier date rather than the later 11 12 date --13:22:4213 THE COURT: I understand --13:22:4314 MS. CORDOVA: -- but we understand your ruling. 13:22:4415 THE COURT: -- and I've overruled that. All right. 16 Thank y'all. 13:22:4817 (Proceedings concluded at 1:22 p.m.) 18 -000-I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 19 from the record of proceedings in the above matter. 20 21 22 Date: September 15, 2023 /s/ Heather Alcaraz 23 Signature of Court Reporter 24 25

Case 4:22-cr-00612 Docu	mM\$680LAiNO67[24]16/2/8in	7 XSD Page 97 of 133
MR. ARMSTRONG: [66]	19/10 19/23 22/23 49/25	/s [1] 96/23
35/23 37/9 38/1 38/4 38/19	50/15 50/18 50/25 52/23	
38/22 49/18 49/21 52/25	65/5 65/11 86/6 89/2 89/7	0
53/2 53/10 53/15 54/19 55/8	89/23 90/17 91/2 92/10	0040 [1] 1/24
55/13 55/18 55/24 56/2	92/18 92/21	02110 [1] 2/14
56/11 56/17 56/19 57/19	THE CASE MANAGER:	0801 [1] 1/14
58/3 58/9 59/15 59/20 59/22	[1] 53/9	1
59/24 60/2 61/18 61/22 62/4	THE COURT: [134]	10 [2] 66/22 72/3
62/7 62/12 66/2 67/25 68/3	THE REPORTER: [4] 58/21 75/6 87/4 91/16	10,000 [2] 69/14 70/6
71/6 71/9 71/12 71/15 72/10	38/21 /3/0 8//4 91/10	100 [2] 50/17 73/9
72/21 73/14 73/19 74/11	\$	100,000,000 [1] 73/18
74/23 84/12 84/14 84/19	\$10 [1] 73/17	100,000,000 [1] 1/16
84/22 85/6 85/15 85/21	\$10,000 [1] 91/4	1001 [1] 3/6
85/24 88/23 90/7 90/14	\$100,000 [11] 32/6 50/6	10016 [1] 1/24
92/20 94/1 94/16 94/19	50/21 51/5 51/23 52/5 52/15	1099 [1] 59/15
94/22 95/21 95/24 96/8	60/19 60/22 65/8 87/8	1099-B [2] 48/9 48/12
MR. CORDOVA: [1]	\$114 [2] 42/20 45/3	1099-Bs [7] 47/6 47/18
62/17	\$114 million [2] 42/20 45/3	47/20 47/23 48/19 49/4
MR. FERTITTA: [2]	\$2 [1] 11/3	61/11
24/16 49/14	\$2 million [1] 11/3	1099s [13] 54/18 54/22
MR. FORD: [20] 40/3	\$2,000 [1] 32/6	54/25 55/2 55/5 61/22 61/23
42/11 42/13 42/24 43/3	\$20,000 [1] 32/7	62/3 62/10 62/14 62/14
45/11 46/9 46/13 47/3 47/11	\$50 [1] 42/15	62/22 62/25
58/19 58/23 63/12 75/4 75/8	\$50 million [1] 42/15	10:00 o'clock [1] 6/23
78/1 87/2 87/6 88/25 89/10	\$600,000 [1] 35/6	10:42 [1] 1/6
MR. HILDER: [1] 49/13	\$80 [4] 41/18 45/3 45/15	11 [6] 43/2 68/11 68/13
MR. LEWIS: [6] 14/4 14/6	45/22	68/17 68/20 81/22
14/17 17/9 49/10 63/5	\$80 million [4] 41/18 45/3	11th [1] 81/17
MR. MALLETT: [3]	45/15 45/22	12 [1] 84/25
31/10 31/12 49/16	\$89 [1] 87/17	120 [1] 53/12
MR. REYES: [2] 28/21	\$9.7 [1] 42/14	1207 [1] 3/3
49/12 MD DOSEN. [9] 5/19	\$9.7 million [1] 42/14	125,000 [1] 25/24
MR. ROSEN: [8] 5/18 5/20 6/4 7/3 9/19 10/11 64/6	_	12:18 [1] 66/25
65/12		12:30 [1] 66/23
MR. WILLIAMS: [4]	every [1] 10/6	12:36 [1] 66/25
39/17 39/20 81/2 83/8	I [1] 71/13 Mr. Constantinescu	13th [1] 48/11
MR. ZADEH: [2] 94/12	Mr. Constantinescu's [1]	1400 [1] 1/13
94/23	53/19	 1401 [1] 3/10
MS. CORDOVA: [12]	only [1] 10/15	14th [1] 44/3
4/18 27/18 49/15 62/13 63/1	•	15 [3] 32/3 72/3 96/22
66/4 68/12 68/16 94/24 95/5	L J	15-minute [1] 66/23
96/9 96/14	- 000 [1]	1500 [1] 2/3
		1545 [2] 2/6 2/17

1 Case 4:22-cr-00612 Docu	7250-5584 [#i] e3/dr704/16/24 in	503-6388 ddd 9b/2d 133
16th [2] 20/24 21/5	25th [1] 53/22	512 [2] 1/21 2/4
17 [2] 63/13 63/17	26 [2] 82/24 83/1	515 [1] 3/16
17,000,000 [1] 42/17	26th [1] 2/14	 523-7878 [1] 3/4
18-hour [1] 16/23	275 [1] 1/23	5300 [1] 2/24
1800 [1] 2/4	29th [1] 34/4	545-9790 [1] 3/7
19 [11] 10/23 13/15 16/6	2:55 p.m [1] 7/14	 5584 [1] 3/17
59/4 82/13 82/14 82/15	3	567-9000 [1] 1/17
82/19 82/25 83/20 83/22		 59 [1] 41/20
19 because [1] 83/9	3,000,000 [1] 42/17	5th [4] 33/22 33/24 34/3
19 I [1] 10/12	300 [1] 73/10	77/19
1900 [2] 2/25 3/10	302 [1] 89/10	6
1:22 [1] 96/17	31st [1] 51/3	
1.22 [1] 90/17 1A [1] 69/23	346 [1] 51/2	60 [1] 28/1
1st [1] 42/15	350-odd [1] 83/2	600 [1] 3/13
	353-0801 [1] 1/14	611 [1] 82/6
2	370-1800 [1] 2/4	612 [1] 1/5
2 percent [1] 32/7	3700 [1] 1/20	617 [1] 2/15
20 [5] 24/21 26/17 32/3 64/1	383 [1] 31/20	6187 [1] 3/14
76/19	388 [1] 33/14	620 [1] 1/20
200 [2] 2/6 73/9	397 [21] 5/1 9/13 9/21 9/23	6388 [1] 1/21
20005 [1] 1/14	10/10 10/13 11/11 13/14	655-9111 [1] 2/12
202 [1] 1/14	26/18 42/20 43/1 43/5 57/1	66 [1] 10/3
2021 [6] 41/23 42/14 42/15	59/5 64/23 67/6 67/25 72/19	6th [1] 33/22
44/9 46/23 53/22	72/23 74/13 85/9	7
2022 [2] 21/8 44/4	397-odd [1] 64/18	700 [1] 2/17
2023 [2] 1/9 96/22	3:00 p.m [1] 7/15	700 percent [1] 11/5
20th [1] 20/24	3rd [1] 77/19	713 [8] 1/17 2/7 2/12 2/18
21 [2] 33/14 91/6	4	2/25 3/4 3/11 3/17
212 [1] 1/24	4,500 [2] 25/25 26/2	723-9900 [1] 2/21
214 [1] 3/14	40 [2] 13/17 69/14	725-8743 [1] 2/7
22 [1] 34/15	404 [1] 43/6	75 [2] 36/10 36/16
225 [1] 2/14	4444 [1] 2/18	75,000,000 [1] 44/12
2255s [1] 13/11	4449 [1] 3/11	750 [1] 2/24
227-4444 [1] 2/18	45 [10] 10/15 10/19 36/4	752-4449 [1] 3/11
23 [2] 29/7 34/16	36/9 72/25 73/1 74/14 82/25	
2300 [1] 1/16	83/22 85/18	77002 [3] 1/17 3/7 3/17
2323 [1] 3/13	4:22-CR-612 [1] 1/5	77006 [1] 2/11
236-1900 [1] 2/25	4th [1] 77/20	77007 [1] 2/24
23rd [5] 5/15 5/17 6/24	5	77008 [3] 2/7 2/18 2/21
16/18 18/7		77010 [1] 3/10
24 [1] 1/23	5,000,000 [1] 44/16	77019 [1] 3/4
25 [1] 76/19	50 [1] 69/14	78701 [1] 2/4
25 megabytes [1] 65/17	50,000,000 [1] 48/4	78738 [1] 1/21

7 Case 4:22-cr-00612 Docu	accurate [4] 2009 20/16/24 in	adarissipadd 9912/123
7878 [1] 3/4	26/14 29/16	adopt [1] 31/19
	acknowledge [1] 27/6	adopted [1] 96/2
8	act [2] 27/25 73/23	adroitly [1] 17/25
80,000,000 [1] 44/12	acted [1] 18/23	advance [1] 82/2
8004 [1] 3/16	acting [3] 35/10 42/2 46/18	advises [1] 34/23
801 [2] 37/12 37/12	action [5] 1/4 74/17 74/17	affected [1] 82/15
802-9157 [1] 2/15	83/14 83/17	affiant [1] 52/10
803 [2] 3/6 81/22	actionable [1] 67/20	affidavit [6] 25/10 52/2
819 [1] 2/11	active [1] 43/21	52/2 52/6 52/14 95/9
832 [2] 2/21 3/7	actively [1] 27/3	affidavits [2] 66/8 95/17
858-0040 [1] 1/24	activity [2] 33/5 48/2	affirmative [3] 60/17 72/25
8743 [1] 2/7	actual [15] 20/2 20/2 30/5	76/4
9	34/25 36/19 59/18 64/20	affirmatively [1] 60/9
9,000,000 [1] 42/16	65/16 65/20 67/13 73/5	after [10] 15/13 19/5 20/18
90 percent [1] 7/6	75/12 77/10 96/2 96/4	29/25 37/20 40/25 41/2 51/6
900-plus [1] 20/12	actually [38] 4/7 7/23 7/24	58/25 68/18
9000 [1] 1/17	11/18 20/9 23/3 23/6 23/8	again [11] 9/4 9/11 13/17
902 [2] 2/20 81/22	23/18 25/25 26/12 30/4 30/5 31/4 36/20 37/3 40/12 41/7	18/25 46/10 53/2 67/9 74/12 76/13 80/13 83/19
9111 [1] 2/12	50/10 54/17 58/10 60/9	against [4] 11/18 21/18
9157 [1] 2/15	60/24 61/7 62/21 64/20	32/11 91/8
919 [1] 2/3	64/22 65/9 65/15 79/10 81/4	
953-6187 [1] 3/14	82/9 84/6 85/17 88/12 93/19	agency [1] 64/8
9790 [1] 3/7	95/24 96/4	agent [30] 28/13 50/11
9900 [1] 2/21	actually so [1] 30/4	50/16 50/21 50/22 50/22
$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	acutely [1] 17/1	51/4 51/17 51/22 52/5 52/10
	adamantly [1] 5/3	59/25 60/3 60/3 60/5 60/5
A.M [1] 1/6	add [5] 19/12 29/1 36/13	60/5 60/6 60/7 60/8 60/9
AARON [1] 1/19	46/7 73/5	60/12 60/16 66/13 71/24
able [9] 22/24 23/3 23/4	add-ons [1] 46/7	86/5 87/18 90/20 95/6 95/14
32/1 33/19 48/20 62/21	added [1] 22/10	agent's [2] 65/7 87/21
76/18 77/23	addition [4] 19/16 20/17	agents [2] 50/6 60/6
about because [1] 39/24	23/20 24/12	aggregate [1] 82/20
about go [1] 39/23 above [1] 96/20	additional [4] 20/25 22/6	ago [8] 20/21 20/24 29/14
absent [3] 25/8 27/7 27/9	35/21 83/1	64/1 69/5 69/5 77/17 81/11
absolute [1] 53/6	address [8] 37/24 39/4	agree [10] 8/12 10/11 27/18
absolutely [4] 16/15 16/16	49/18 49/19 50/1 64/6 82/1	45/12 75/4 75/8 76/8 77/24
18/5 74/14	82/7	81/10 81/22
access [7] 20/7 25/3 27/2	addressed [2] 67/2 68/11	agreed [1] 33/16
30/22 44/10 44/23 62/18	adequately [1] 36/5	agreements [2] 27/5 27/5
accessible [2] 22/20 22/22	admissible [8] 17/19 36/20	ahead [6] 9/4 39/23 61/21
accomplish [1] 89/23	37/1 37/5 39/12 45/10 45/11	81/1 84/13 93/25
accounts [1] 62/22	92/5	air [1] 89/20

A Case 4:22-cr-00612 **Alcaraz [2]** 3/15 96/23 ALEJANDRO [1] 2/2 allegations [1] 59/3 **allege [1]** 41/18 **alleged [7]** 5/2 11/8 15/18 24/3 25/23 25/23 50/8 **allow [3]** 40/7 45/2 89/20 allowed [1] 45/21 allowing [2] 27/21 92/3 almost-as-large [1] 81/11 alone [1] 83/1 along [1] 85/12 already [6] 15/6 29/2 58/13 61/12 78/13 85/18 **Alt [1]** 64/21 altering [2] 44/6 44/7 **alternative [2]** 4/14 69/1 **although [3]** 67/11 78/9 84/9 always [2] 7/5 34/11 **AMC** [1] 42/6 amend [2] 33/16 84/3 **Amendment [3]** 13/1 28/16 29/4 **AMERICA** [1] 1/4 **American** [1] 17/5 **Ameritrade [8]** 47/13 47/16 47/17 47/19 63/8 63/11 78/1 78/2 amnesia [1] 37/17 amount [4] 5/22 18/12 26/17 73/12 ample [1] 14/12 analyses [1] 58/24 analysis [6] 30/18 52/7 55/8 55/18 57/21 60/18 analyst [2] 51/3 52/12 **analyzed [2]** 5/25 21/10 **ANDREW [2]** 1/8 2/16 angry [1] 89/15 ankle [1] 5/8 another [7] 8/8 11/14 30/7 34/9 82/24 83/1 88/14

Docum**enother's #14**d88/b2/16/24 in taken't 151a29/25 39/19 42/9 answer [9] 17/6 69/6 71/7 71/7 71/22 71/23 77/13 79/7 79/12 answers [1] 79/8 antagonistic [1] 38/10 any -- any [2] 10/16 66/8 anybody [5] 28/19 47/22 65/3 81/5 94/20 anybody's [1] 83/18 anymore [1] 77/25 anyone [2] 32/12 49/7 anyone's [1] 29/7 **anything [17]** 10/20 24/2 24/9 24/10 28/9 43/12 45/7 47/24 56/10 57/7 57/17 82/23 86/13 89/22 89/22 90/3 94/7 anyway [2] 78/7 80/24 anywhere [3] 17/4 74/13 78/17 apart [1] 87/24 **apologize** [1] 58/20 **appear [2]** 12/6 83/14 APPEARANCES [3] 1/10 2/1 3/1 appeared [1] 15/12 **appears** [5] 21/24 43/16 46/11 47/15 51/1 **Applegate** [5] 59/25 60/3 60/8 60/12 60/16 apply [1] 94/16 appreciate [2] 31/8 56/12 **appreciate -- I [1]** 56/12 **approach [9]** 14/4 19/8 24/20 26/13 30/2 31/10 53/13 66/6 66/15 appropriate [1] 29/19 approved [2] 66/9 96/2 **April [8]** 69/8 76/15 76/16 76/20 80/25 82/2 83/8 85/3 are -- is [1] 26/8 are -- it [1] 30/14 are -- with [1] 12/15

57/1 76/6 arguably [1] 17/3 argue [2] 76/7 76/9 **arguing** [1] 76/5 **argument** [2] 55/2 91/9 **ARMSTRONG** [15] 1/12 35/24 39/24 40/13 41/15 48/10 52/24 63/20 65/2 67/23 69/19 71/4 86/8 93/25 95/19 around [10] 6/25 16/22 38/18 45/21 53/24 76/25 81/19 83/3 93/1 93/3 arrest [1] 60/14 arrested [1] 60/15 **article [2]** 25/16 25/19 articles [1] 40/25 as -- as [1] 23/22 **Ashcroft** [1] 2/3 aside [2] 91/12 92/24 ask [22] 10/9 27/20 28/11 34/1 35/20 49/3 53/8 53/8 56/13 56/20 58/10 58/11 64/7 64/23 65/20 87/20 89/2 90/8 90/24 94/9 95/17 96/11 asked [1] 66/17 asking [4] 27/14 58/9 80/12 82/14 **aspersions [3]** 14/20 15/4 17/17 **assembled** [1] 25/5 asserted [1] 4/20 assess [1] 24/24 assets [6] 52/20 90/4 90/4 90/23 90/24 91/4 assist [1] 34/22 assistance [2] 29/7 35/19 Associates [1] 2/10 assure [3] 15/15 15/23 41/16 Atlas [3] 26/24 27/1 43/24 attached [2] 90/7 90/11 attaching [1] 95/9

Filed on 04/16/24 in 146/17 49/23 52/16 53/5 56/5 Document 663 A Case 4:22-cr-00612 attack [2] 4/7 52/17 back [32] 10/2 17/11 18/12 **attacking** [1] 51/13 20/5 21/15 22/1 22/19 23/13 attempt [1] 75/13 23/17 28/6 29/15 30/5 36/12 **attempting** [1] 75/22 37/18 41/15 41/16 53/25 54/1 55/11 62/21 65/14 attend [1] 93/3 attention [5] 24/11 31/9 65/21 66/23 71/3 73/3 73/4 40/7 49/1 75/9 78/14 84/18 88/6 88/20 **attenuate** [1] 16/11 89/15 93/11 attestations [1] 27/5 back-door [2] 41/15 41/16 attorney [12] 3/3 28/15 **backlog** [1] 16/10 29/22 36/24 52/20 53/19 ball [1] 24/12 54/21 89/5 90/2 90/3 90/10 **ballpark** [1] 72/2 bank [6] 50/18 50/19 50/20 90/22 **Attorney's [1]** 1/16 54/9 61/24 87/19 attorneys [5] 20/14 45/12 bar [1] 88/4 bars [1] 87/20 76/19 77/2 92/15 attributable [2] 40/24 44/12 **based [6]** 13/7 22/6 43/14 67/12 84/2 86/19 **attributed** [1] 41/19 bases [4] 20/13 28/25 29/18 **August [3]** 20/24 21/5 34/4 **August 16th [2]** 20/24 21/5 30/1 August 29th [1] 34/4 basic [1] 85/1 **AUSA [6]** 20/20 89/5 90/2 basically [8] 6/10 6/11 6/16 67/12 69/8 77/7 86/18 88/21 90/19 90/22 91/3 basis [2] 30/17 30/24 **AUSAs** [1] 87/10 **Austin [3]** 1/21 2/4 15/10 Bates [1] 61/16 authenticate [1] 77/8 **bathroom** [1] 9/8 be -- the [1] 70/23 authentication [1] 18/14 authenticity [1] 12/20 be -- to [1] 49/6 **author** [1] 15/7 **bear** [1] 39/9 automatic [1] 9/9 beat [1] 80/22 availability [2] 90/4 90/23 beating [1] 16/25 been [29] 4/22 7/20 8/7 13/6 **available** [1] 27/7 **Avenue [4]** 1/13 1/23 2/3 13/19 15/6 15/9 15/10 15/16 16/7 17/3 20/11 26/18 38/17 3/13 average [2] 13/2 13/3 38/21 40/17 43/15 43/16 43/21 46/21 51/4 59/21 average -- we [1] 13/2 avoid [1] 82/7 61/12 61/13 64/7 72/16 aware [4] 34/14 38/24 75/24 80/5 96/2 60/12 63/1 beeps [1] 5/8 away [3] 29/19 76/20 89/14 **before [26]** 1/8 13/24 13/24 awful [1] 77/2 17/3 18/15 22/9 28/20 29/11 **Axiom [1]** 21/13 30/23 30/25 35/17 36/10 36/11 36/16 39/13 42/5

58/25 60/14 79/9 84/4 84/24 **beforehand** [1] 19/5 begin [1] 24/13 **beginning** [1] 16/17 **behalf [4]** 4/6 4/19 5/20 28/22 behavior [1] 29/23 **behind** [2] 34/18 74/18 **beholden** [1] 84/16 being [10] 36/2 36/3 36/4 39/7 52/4 53/5 55/8 56/3 56/4 70/17 believe [16] 16/25 30/12 33/1 33/2 40/5 40/14 44/10 47/23 48/4 51/9 53/12 59/24 60/13 72/3 90/7 90/14 believed [1] 72/13 believes [1] 32/14 below [1] 12/12 bench [3] 86/8 91/20 92/22 beneath [1] 81/23 **Bentwater** [1] 88/22 besides [1] 47/1 best [4] 63/24 78/15 80/7 80/8 better [5] 6/8 71/17 79/11 85/17 92/16 between [13] 7/13 14/3 35/9 37/13 42/14 42/14 53/17 66/13 70/13 74/16 83/8 88/10 89/4 beyond [2] 25/7 95/15 **big** [10] 9/2 9/15 9/15 11/17 26/1 46/20 68/19 70/2 76/3 80/1 bigger [3] 46/20 80/2 84/20 **billion** [1] 64/1 **bit** [7] 4/3 30/3 37/21 53/4 61/19 65/14 72/24 blanket [1] 95/2 **blazing** [1] 25/18 **blotters** [1] 61/25 **blunt [1]** 86/17

B Case 4:22-cr-00612 Docum	Bryon 3[1]F6944on 04/16
boggling [1] 55/4	Bs [7] 47/6 47/18 47/2
books [2] 8/4 8/4	47/23 48/19 49/4 61/1
Boom [1] 9/3	bucket [3] 51/15 51/2
born [1] 81/14	52/18
Boston [1] 2/14	buckets [1] 50/3
both [7] 26/14 32/10 67/12	budgeted [1] 35/16
67/16 67/19 81/8 84/16	bugged [1] 81/3
bots [4] 26/8 26/10 26/11	built [1] 76/25
26/12	bulk [1] 18/9
bought [6] 18/25 32/2 41/12	bunch [2] 11/21 82/17
45/18 48/13 72/7	burden [1] 89/11
Boulevard [4] 2/6 2/11 2/17	bureaucracies [2] 84/84/24
2/20	buried [1] 21/6
box [1] 9/19	bus [1] 43/17
boxes [1] 17/13	business [4] 77/12 77/
Brady [27] 30/8 40/5 40/9	78/5 81/22
47/2 49/2 50/2 51/9 51/14	buy [8] 9/15 32/5 32/1
51/19 51/25 56/8 58/13	32/13 53/25 54/1 72/1
58/14 58/15 59/11 60/21	72/16
60/21 60/22 67/3 87/23	buying [2] 29/24 30/1
90/18 90/25 91/1 91/2 91/25	buys [2] 8/22 23/23
92/15 92/17	
branches [1] 46/22	\mathbf{C}
BRANDON [1] 3/2	calculation [1] 42/19
break [4] 66/23 93/1 93/2 93/4	call [4] 32/2 34/6 35/1
brief [4] 25/11 29/2 29/10	82/24
91/13	called [2] 41/7 77/25
briefings [1] 90/10	came [8] 22/2 40/21 4
briefly [5] 5/20 14/7 28/21	44/13 45/5 45/20 68/1
47/4 64/6	89/15
bring [6] 15/22 57/1 75/15	camera [1] 66/17
79/6 79/17 93/11	can we [1] 9/16
brings [1] 41/17	Can what's [1] 63/2 can't [15] 19/15 26/19
broad [1] 59/9	34/10 37/3 45/23 56/9
broker [6] 47/7 47/11 48/3	56/21 62/25 70/1 70/2
63/6 63/15 63/17	70/18 77/25 83/21
brokerage [1] 63/11	cannot [4] 17/2 29/6 3
brother [4] 50/22 86/5 87/8	44/20
87/18	captures [1] 54/11
brought [3] 14/10 40/6	care [2] 51/6 51/17
54/21	carefully [1] 32/9
BROWN [1] 2/19	CARTER [4] 1/15 53
	L J

Brive 11 F69/4 on 04/16/24 in 189/25 99/9e 102 of 133 **Bs [7]** 47/6 47/18 47/20 47/23 48/19 49/4 61/11 **bucket** [3] 51/15 51/20 52/18 buckets [1] 50/3 **budgeted** [1] 35/16 **bugged** [1] 81/3 built [1] 76/25 **bulk** [1] 18/9 **bunch [2]** 11/21 82/17 **burden [1]** 89/11 bureaucracies [2] 84/17 84/24 buried [1] 21/6 bus [1] 43/17 business [4] 77/12 77/14 78/5 81/22 **buy [8]** 9/15 32/5 32/10 32/13 53/25 54/1 72/15 72/16 buying [2] 29/24 30/14 buys [2] 8/22 23/23

call [4] 32/2 34/6 35/14 82/24 called [2] 41/7 77/25 came [8] 22/2 40/21 42/3 44/13 45/5 45/20 68/18 89/15 camera [1] 66/17 can -- we [1] 9/16 Can -- what's [1] 63/10 can't [15] 19/15 26/19 34/10 37/3 45/23 56/9 56/20 56/21 62/25 70/1 70/2 70/16 70/18 77/25 83/21 cannot [4] 17/2 29/6 36/5 44/20 **captures** [1] 54/11 care [2] 51/6 51/17 carefully [1] 32/9 caused [9] 30/14 31/2 31/3 **CARTER [4]** 1/15 53/1

case [92] 5/1 5/4 5/22 6/9 6/11 6/19 6/20 8/10 10/22 12/24 13/3 13/23 14/3 14/12 14/18 15/6 15/12 16/15 18/4 19/11 19/18 19/21 19/25 21/3 21/8 21/21 24/15 28/17 29/3 29/7 30/2 30/3 30/16 31/2 31/16 31/17 33/13 35/13 36/7 36/9 38/18 39/4 39/5 41/10 41/14 43/8 43/18 44/17 46/20 46/20 48/25 49/9 51/4 52/19 56/5 57/12 60/7 60/10 60/17 60/20 60/24 61/24 67/16 67/17 69/17 70/3 70/7 70/9 70/10 70/16 70/17 71/5 71/19 71/21 71/23 71/24 71/25 74/8 75/11 75/13 75/23 76/13 76/17 76/24 80/16 81/12 84/6 84/23 93/17 94/5 95/6 95/17 case -- this [1] 46/20 **caseload** [1] 16/13 cases [9] 13/4 16/6 16/13 16/14 32/2 35/12 35/13 70/5 83/15 cases -- every [1] 16/13 cash [1] 8/8 cast [2] 14/20 17/17 casting [1] 15/4 categorical [3] 37/13 66/6 66/15 categorically [1] 37/10 categories [4] 47/3 54/16 54/17 59/12 category [3] 48/24 49/1 49/17 causation [15] 31/1 31/1 39/11 39/11 40/14 41/6 41/9 41/17 44/18 44/20 76/4 76/5 76/7 76/9 76/24 cause [3] 32/16 40/20 81/9

Docum**choesing Hile** $\sqrt{3}$ $\sqrt{16/24}$ in together the $\sqrt{3}$ Case 4:22-cr-00612 **chose [2]** 48/6 52/15 collaboration [1] 32/23 caused... [6] 41/11 42/6 **colleague [2]** 40/7 75/22 **Christmas** [1] 16/22 42/8 44/21 45/6 76/12 Circuit [4] 38/7 67/12 67/17 colleagues [4] 13/5 29/5 causes [1] 40/19 81/24 29/13 82/16 causing [1] 40/23 **collect** [1] 62/23 circumstances [1] 24/14 **cautious** [1] 32/9 cited [1] 56/4 **combat** [1] 57/15 certain [7] 21/14 22/23 civic [1] 80/8 **combined** [2] 16/2 45/3 29/24 30/15 88/20 90/1 civil [2] 16/2 92/3 come [15] 9/11 9/12 10/2 94/10 claim [3] 28/25 35/10 67/15 16/20 16/21 20/22 34/16 certainly [4] 10/24 56/11 45/17 46/24 66/23 76/10 **claiming** [1] 35/8 62/12 74/23 claims [1] 61/7 78/4 78/13 81/6 88/20 certainty [2] 40/4 56/21 clear [5] 31/4 38/7 54/14 come -- it [1] 16/20 certify [1] 96/19 61/18 76/20 comes [3] 37/11 38/9 92/7 cetera [1] 14/20 clearer [1] 15/3 **coming [4]** 11/22 43/7 56/3 **chain** [1] 89/12 72/20 clearly [3] 28/2 31/2 77/20 chains [1] 12/7 client [27] 15/18 17/21 **comment** [1] 31/15 chair [6] 42/1 42/2 42/3 comments [2] 24/18 86/19 18/14 18/19 24/8 25/22 28/8 42/7 44/4 46/18 41/10 42/13 42/15 43/9 **Commission** [2] 41/21 **challenge** [1] 29/19 43/11 44/12 44/16 45/2 45/5 75/15 challenges [1] 81/9 commit [3] 11/9 60/24 45/15 46/10 47/12 50/13 challenging [1] 81/16 50/20 69/4 80/14 82/23 88/1 73/16 **chambers** [1] 86/24 88/15 89/9 **committed** [3] 10/21 73/16 **chance** [1] 26/19 client's [13] 11/2 12/25 75/17 **chances** [1] 83/20 17/11 38/20 41/1 47/23 49/5 **committing** [1] 10/20 **change [3]** 33/17 35/6 85/2 50/23 52/20 64/18 78/16 communication [2] 43/21 **changes** [4] 9/6 9/10 30/1 90/3 90/23 47/16 40/23 clients [3] 13/16 28/3 80/18 communications [5] 70/13 **channel** [1] 26/25 86/12 88/7 90/11 90/13 clients' [1] 13/1 **charged [9]** 9/22 11/3 11/25 **close [1]** 74/13 company [1] 88/13 13/17 64/18 64/22 71/14 **cloud [2]** 4/21 5/7 **compare [3]** 11/18 22/13 72/2 75/24 **co** [1] 60/6 22/14 charged -- we [1] 11/25 **co-leads -- or [1]** 60/6 **compel** [8] 33/9 39/16 39/18 **charging** [1] 44/3 **cocounsel** [1] 12/21 40/9 41/17 55/1 66/5 94/24 **Charles** [1] 7/25 **cocounsel's** [1] 24/18 **compelling** [6] 38/4 38/8 **charts** [10] 6/1 9/14 11/15 38/8 38/15 39/10 71/18 code [1] 27/4 23/20 23/22 71/18 75/12 codefendants [10] 4/24 **compiled** [1] 14/23 75/17 77/1 81/21 5/10 26/17 33/1 33/5 48/21 complaining [1] 34/2 **chase [3]** 39/10 39/11 39/11 49/7 54/18 59/14 59/19 complaints [1] 35/6 check [2] 23/17 65/25 codefendants' [3] 5/13 **complete** [1] 36/18 **checking** [1] 21/13 62/24 77/2 **completely [3]** 10/11 36/18 chide [1] 33/7 coding [1] 26/24 95/15 child's [1] 81/13 **cogent** [1] 57/24 complex [2] 13/4 38/17 China [1] 57/8 cognizable [1] 61/7 **complexity** [2] 16/14 29/10 CHIP [1] 3/2

Case 4:22-cr-00612 **complicated** [1] 27/12 **complied** [1] 37/20 **compliment** [1] 24/22 comprehension [1] 95/15 **comprise** [1] 7/12 computer [2] 3/25 5/25 computers [1] 9/7 **concede** [1] 45/23 concept [1] 60/21 concern [4] 23/14 29/6 69/22 84/15 concerned [3] 61/19 89/17 92/2 **concerning** [1] 91/14 **concerns** [1] 35/1 **concert** [1] 74/16 concise [3] 48/1 48/8 80/16 **conclude** [1] 40/13 **concluded** [1] 96/17 **conclusion** [1] 58/24 conclusions [1] 59/3 **conducted** [1] 43/25 **confer [1]** 13/10 **confines** [1] 49/9 **Congrats** [1] 54/5 Congress [5] 2/3 42/4 42/5 46/17 46/19 congressional [3] 41/24 46/5 46/6 conservative [2] 75/21 76/23 consider [4] 56/18 79/2 80/16 83/25 consideration [2] 78/25 82/4 considered [1] 50/2 consistently [1] 18/23 **conspiracy** [11] 15/19 32/23 38/24 38/25 43/6 47/25 50/8 50/13 59/5 74/17 83/21 CONSTANTINESCU [16] 1/6 1/18 19/12 39/15 41/18

Docum 45/863/17 163/19 54/2024 in touries 124 g65/14 79/83 53/23 54/4 54/7 60/13 60/23 copy [1] 96/5 63/8 88/10 Constantinescu's [8] 29/21 30/10 33/9 39/18 53/19 54/20 86/3 91/4 **constantly** [1] 32/19 constitutional [2] 28/4 35/19 **consultant** [1] 34/21 **contained** [1] 59/6 **contemporaneous** [1] 74/15 **corrected** [2] 35/4 85/7 contention [1] 6/12 **contentious** [1] 88/12 **contest** [1] 24/10 context [4] 7/23 15/3 15/20 19/1 **continuance** [15] 4/13 4/14 24/15 24/18 27/15 29/9 30/8 31/19 33/10 39/21 68/25 69/3 78/24 81/14 96/10 **continued** [4] 2/1 3/1 48/14 91/20 contradictory [1] 87/16 contradicts [1] 59/2 **contrary** [1] 66/16 control [4] 16/8 16/9 16/10 44/15 controlling [1] 12/23 **conversation** [5] 12/8 17/15 46/1 90/19 90/25 conversations [7] 52/18 52/21 86/11 89/4 89/8 89/25 90/22 convicted [1] 7/8 **conviction [2]** 80/19 83/25 **convincing** [2] 74/9 92/7 cooperators [1] 71/21 **COOPERMAN** [7] 3/2 16/17 17/2 27/14 49/10 63/6 94/4 **Cooperman's** [1] 36/24 **coordinate** [1] 76/18 coordinating [1] 74/17

copying [1] 63/20 **CORDOVA** [6] 3/9 4/18 27/16 38/2 68/9 69/4 **Cordova's [1]** 37/15 core [1] 5/3 corner [1] 37/4 **corporate** [1] 25/19 correct [6] 12/17 29/25 32/17 53/3 88/23 96/19 correspondence [1] 88/9 **could [23]** 11/9 11/9 15/3 24/7 26/16 30/2 30/2 36/15 41/1 46/24 49/8 49/18 60/25 61/1 61/15 76/8 81/7 81/17 83/8 83/10 83/11 84/25 87/4 counsel [6] 4/4 5/13 30/10 35/19 61/11 62/24 **count [7]** 67/2 70/25 70/25 70/25 78/20 78/20 91/5 **counting [2]** 5/23 29/8 counts [5] 15/20 18/20 28/7 68/11 72/1 couple [7] 13/8 13/25 29/1 65/23 88/8 93/5 93/15 couple-month [1] 13/8 **course [14]** 24/21 29/19 36/6 50/19 52/13 59/20 59/22 66/2 68/3 70/18 72/11 74/19 78/5 86/1 court [43] 1/1 3/15 3/16 6/13 9/16 14/3 14/11 14/13 14/16 15/15 15/15 16/16 16/19 16/20 16/20 16/22 16/23 16/25 17/6 17/6 17/14 17/18 17/25 18/5 27/20 28/11 28/25 32/21 35/14 35/20 38/7 38/24 43/14 52/16 53/14 64/4 67/13 67/16 83/25 86/24 91/18 94/3 96/23 Court's [7] 14/10 15/22

Case 4:22-cr-00612 Court's... [5] 16/2 31/8 31/14 31/15 40/6 courtesy [1] 60/14 **courtroom [4]** 37/18 80/1 81/12 93/11 **courtrooms** [1] 80/3 cover [1] 4/5 covered [2] 65/4 68/24 **COVID** [1] 16/10 **CR [1]** 1/5 crawl [1] 22/19 crazy [1] 12/5 **create [3]** 11/16 48/6 95/4 created [1] 28/5 creates [1] 20/19 **creating** [1] 48/15 credibility [2] 51/13 52/17 crime [1] 7/8 criminal [4] 1/4 6/8 16/2 64/15 crisp [1] 80/4 critical [4] 8/10 8/18 9/25 48/25 criticizing [1] 51/12 cross [10] 11/12 52/9 61/2 70/10 71/13 71/14 77/21 78/15 83/12 84/4 cross-examination [4] 61/2 70/10 77/21 78/15 cross-examinations [1] 84/4 cross-examine [3] 11/12 52/9 83/12 crossed [1] 85/12 **crucial [2]** 30/12 30/12 **cry** [1] 37/20 **CSR [1]** 3/15 **cumulative** [1] 10/25 **current [3]** 17/5 42/3 46/18 currently [4] 22/20 23/1 30/8 40/4 **custody** [1] 86/19 cute [1] 40/21

D

Dallas [1] 3/13 dark [1] 44/7 **darndest** [1] 86/1 data [32] 5/24 6/20 10/4 20/7 21/10 21/18 22/7 22/23 23/8 24/19 24/20 24/24 25/3 25/3 25/5 25/7 25/9 25/12 25/13 25/20 26/4 26/10 26/14 26/14 26/15 26/22 26/24 26/24 27/2 65/6 65/23 71/16 data-driven [1] 24/20 database [2] 22/19 23/2 date [11] 5/15 5/17 19/15 33/22 37/18 93/14 94/7 94/10 96/11 96/12 96/22 dated [1] 34/4 **dating** [1] 88/1 **DAVIS** [2] 2/16 2/17 day [25] 8/1 8/4 8/15 9/7 29/24 31/21 31/23 32/3 32/8 32/18 33/19 35/2 37/12 44/3 44/5 48/13 60/13 71/19 71/20 71/22 71/24 71/24 83/3 83/9 84/4 days [12] 16/23 28/1 36/4 36/9 36/10 36/16 67/23 68/4 79/9 91/21 91/22 92/24 days -- I'm [1] 36/9 days' [2] 93/5 93/15 **DC** [1] 1/14 dead [1] 16/25 deadline [3] 20/18 36/12 36/16 **deadlines** [1] 33/12 deal [8] 35/8 44/8 48/24 70/21 81/23 84/1 84/20 92/12 dealer [2] 47/12 48/3

dealing [1] 83/20 dealt [1] 84/23 death [1] 15/13 debate [2] 26/9 55/5 **deceived** [1] 72/17 **deceiving** [1] 67/19 **December [4]** 4/22 5/5 44/3 48/11 **December 13th [1]** 48/11 **December 14th [1]** 44/3 **decided** [1] 37/18 decision [4] 19/19 44/19 45/23 72/16 declaration [1] 33/6 declare [1] 69/10 declared [1] 70/14 **declined** [1] 35/13 decreases [1] 44/14 **DEEL [4]** 2/16 24/17 29/1 49/14 deemed [1] 45/6 **defeat** [1] 10/2 **defeats** [1] 8/11 **defend** [2] 5/13 34/10 defendant [18] 1/18 2/2 2/8 2/16 2/22 3/2 3/8 24/2 32/21 32/22 34/9 37/3 38/12 47/19 70/9 70/11 72/13 82/20 defendant's [2] 33/14 72/18 defendants [31] 5/5 6/12 6/13 7/23 12/10 23/25 27/22 36/9 38/11 40/23 43/22 47/12 54/13 54/24 55/16 56/1 57/16 57/24 58/14 58/18 61/23 62/9 63/8 71/11 71/13 72/24 74/16 78/11 83/10 94/6 94/16 defendants -- and [1] 6/12 defendants -- but [1] 62/9 defendants' [6] 4/17 6/22 14/19 16/9 28/16 37/14 defense [17] 19/14 20/14 26/20 28/15 28/19 30/12

Docum**diatate** [1]=i82/29 04/16/24 in T94/1 Case 4:22-cr-00612 didn't [25] 5/1 19/25 24/9 defense... [11] 31/17 47/22 24/10 30/7 33/23 44/16 49/3 62/23 70/22 74/6 74/25 48/22 51/6 51/6 51/11 51/17 75/10 75/19 82/21 90/2 53/25 57/17 59/10 59/17 **defense -- other [1]** 62/23 65/5 70/25 70/25 70/25 **defenses** [1] 38/10 73/16 85/5 86/20 90/19 defer [1] 39/22 91/23 **defining** [1] 12/11 didn't -- it's [1] 19/25 definitely [3] 12/18 38/22 difference [2] 37/13 73/18 51/14 differences [1] 17/14 **definition** [1] 46/16 different [8] 6/25 11/21 defraud [4] 7/9 7/12 8/11 11/22 37/10 41/6 43/10 9/12 43/11 72/11 degree [2] 38/15 40/3 difficult [2] 20/14 20/21 delays [1] 16/11 difficulty [1] 39/4 delivery [2] 21/11 34/4 dig [2] 20/19 26/20 denial [1] 95/2 **dilatory** [1] 37/16 denied [1] 39/22 **diligently** [1] 27/11 dense [2] 5/24 22/23 **Dillon [3]** 60/5 60/6 60/7 denying [4] 68/8 68/14 dire [3] 79/4 79/15 84/4 68/20 68/25 direct [4] 14/19 53/17 74/16 **Department** [1] 1/13 91/13 **depend** [1] 13/1 directly [1] 82/10 **depend** -- **depends** [1] 13/1 dirty [3] 52/4 89/19 91/6 **depending [3]** 30/4 64/15 disadvantage [1] 43/1 72/11 **disagree** [1] 81/6 depends [1] 13/1 disagreement [1] 50/1 describe [2] 40/18 56/21 **disciplined** [1] 26/13 **described** [4] 36/2 36/3 **disclose** [1] 41/5 36/4 89/13 disclosed [4] 49/9 51/23 descriptions [1] 48/1 51/23 52/6 **designate [2]** 69/16 80/24 disclosed -- he [1] 51/23 designated [2] 38/17 69/14 disclosure [3] 14/17 51/22 designations [1] 69/13 51/24 detail [1] 30/10 disclosures [1] 96/3 details [4] 25/11 25/12 **Discord** [2] 26/24 43/24 25/19 56/19 discovery [11] 33/25 34/3 details -- and [1] 25/11 34/12 50/19 52/13 65/4 70/2 **determine** [2] $1\overline{7}/19$ 66/18 92/4 92/5 94/6 94/20 **determined** [6] 30/14 41/21 discrepancies [1] 21/12 44/13 46/3 50/10 51/11 discrepancy [3] 21/25 22/3 **develop** [2] 8/8 8/9 22/17 devils [1] 56/19 discrete [3] 26/18 85/11 diced [1] 12/6

Page 106 of 133 discuss [5] 37/23 47/4 47/5 49/1 86/23 **discussed** [1] 90/9 **discusses** [1] 66/7 discussing [2] 45/13 46/2 discussion [4] 14/3 86/8 91/20 92/22 disk [1] 34/5 dismiss [8] 28/7 67/9 68/1 68/7 68/13 68/17 68/19 68/21 **disposed** [1] 16/7 **disprove** [1] 48/9 dispute [1] 87/9 **distinction** [1] 55/23 **DISTRICT [4]** 1/1 1/1 1/9 16/2 dividend [2] 70/14 70/15 **DIVISION** [1] 1/2 divorce [5] 52/20 89/4 90/3 90/9 90/22 do -- but [1] 7/1 **document** [5] 14/16 31/20 53/14 62/1 94/3 **documents** [10] 30/18 30/22 47/1 47/18 48/4 54/24 56/20 66/18 93/20 94/4 does [17] 6/9 7/11 16/14 31/16 31/18 38/18 40/14 49/7 58/1 62/17 65/1 65/3 73/13 73/14 73/18 87/1 94/16 **Does -- I [1]** 65/1 doesn't [16] 20/7 23/9 28/13 32/15 33/23 57/7 57/25 60/23 62/16 82/22 82/22 82/23 83/14 84/5 87/20 92/5 |dog [1] 78/20 doing [21] 6/15 6/17 6/17 13/5 18/4 19/4 19/5 20/4 22/7 26/19 27/3 35/1 47/23 48/16 56/24 64/20 72/14 73/4 73/20 73/22 76/2

Documents (2) 84/70/80/84/16/24 in 1918 [5] P23/6148/8f92/32 Case 4:22-cr-00612 94/14 94/21 **Dynamis** [1] 2/13 **DOJ [5]** 24/22 43/14 43/18 **endeavor** [1] 76/14 58/25 64/15 \mathbb{E} ended [1] 44/17 **DOJ's [1]** 59/7 e-mail [8] 21/6 21/9 34/10 **endlessly** [1] 48/5 dollars [1] 51/18 66/7 66/13 90/18 95/9 95/13 **Energy** [1] 25/18 don't -- I [1] 69/25 e-mails [7] 33/14 33/17 59/7 enjoying [1] 88/12 don't -- we [1] 86/23 90/1 90/8 95/5 95/16 enormous [4] 23/19 25/3 don't -- vou've [1] 57/23 **E-Trade [2]** 65/13 65/21 26/17 65/18 done [8] 13/14 18/12 20/11 E-X-P-R [1] 46/14 enough [3] 67/23 80/1 33/18 33/24 79/6 83/21 95/2 each [17] 11/10 12/16 15/18 85/23 door [2] 41/15 41/16 20/18 22/10 23/18 24/1 **Enron** [2] 15/24 70/17 double [1] 13/15 24/25 41/7 41/8 61/19 62/5 enter [1] 49/8 doubt [4] 16/20 43/13 43/13 65/17 70/9 71/22 77/2 81/19 **entered** [1] 25/2 87/12 earlier [3] 7/22 95/1 96/11 entire [3] 17/3 18/25 25/5 down [22] 9/11 9/12 10/22 early [3] 13/8 39/5 41/23 entitled [4] 57/6 57/15 11/6 13/12 13/17 13/23 ease [1] 89/1 57/18 87/15 16/22 26/25 34/16 40/21 eases [1] 91/23 **entries** [1] 48/18 41/13 42/18 44/21 46/14 easiest [1] 54/22 envelope [2] 34/3 34/6 49/24 61/5 77/22 78/4 78/19 easily [1] 48/9 envelopes [2] 34/16 34/18 89/16 91/19 ECF [1] 51/2 episode [3] 24/2 46/11 down -- this [1] 9/11 echo [1] 24/18 79/21 download [1] 23/4 **Eddie's [2]** 52/3 52/4 episodes [15] 5/1 11/1 18/21 dozen [1] 44/1 educational [1] 27/6 24/1 24/8 24/11 42/21 44/25 **Dr.** [1] 11/10 **EDWARD [4]** 1/6 2/23 45/24 59/5 67/6 72/20 73/1 **Dr. Garibotti** [1] 11/10 19/11 31/12 73/5 85/11 draft [4] 63/21 95/9 95/25 effective [3] 26/20 29/7 **Epley** [1] 15/9 96/1 35/19 ERIC [2] 2/13 5/20 **drafting** [1] 52/14 **effectively [1]** 83/13 errors [1] 15/6 dragged [1] 45/15 **efforts** [1] 50/9 **especially [3]** 38/16 74/3 drive [5] 2/24 3/3 34/6 34/8 eight [2] 48/21 70/7 93/9 34/10 **eight-party** [1] 70/7 **essential [2]** 47/21 48/19 driven [1] 24/20 either [8] 44/20 50/5 50/9 essentially [1] 49/5 **driving** [1] 43/16 51/10 57/22 76/5 85/15 91/1 estimate [2] 75/21 76/23 **drug [1]** 70/17 **elaborate** [1] 14/7 estranged [2] 50/23 51/18 **dude** [1] 54/3 **electronic** [2] 23/3 23/8 et [1] 14/20 due [2] 5/12 35/19 **element** [1] 44/20 et cetera [1] 14/20 **dump [9]** 10/2 10/3 11/17 elephant [2] 4/10 82/12 evaluate [1] 14/12 12/11 12/13 18/1 37/4 40/15 **ELMO [2]** 53/7 53/11 even [22] 5/4 11/8 14/13 64/21 else [5] 28/19 38/14 65/3 15/7 18/6 24/10 24/25 27/23 **dumping** [1] 11/23 78/22 93/17 28/7 29/16 38/7 45/9 45/17 dumps [2] 9/22 75/24 embarrassed [1] 33/8 50/12 56/5 56/21 60/11 **duration** [1] 43/22 **embroiled** [1] 15/10 60/12 62/14 64/18 73/9 during [8] 25/14 35/18 42/1 **emphasize** [1] 92/2 77/25 45/19 48/10 50/7 50/7 50/12 **employee** [1] 64/10

E Case 4:22-cr-00612 event [3] 39/21 39/21 90/2 event -- in [1] 39/21 **eventually** [1] 80/14 ever [5] 13/5 13/5 53/25 92/7 95/13 every [15] 9/25 10/6 11/10 12/17 12/25 15/18 16/13 20/5 22/10 29/18 36/7 53/21 62/1 66/13 95/13 everybody [6] 63/22 77/16 78/11 78/21 79/8 81/23 everybody's [2] 63/14 69/9 everyone [4] 13/22 38/14 39/1 39/2 everything [6] 10/5 27/18 68/24 77/8 88/21 93/6 evidence [33] 5/22 15/2 15/25 19/20 22/15 23/12 29/15 29/15 31/4 32/14 36/19 36/22 37/4 37/5 38/5 39/21 39/25 41/8 45/17 54/12 55/6 56/1 57/24 58/8 58/17 71/18 72/25 75/12 82/12 86/22 89/20 92/7 93/8 ex [2] 88/4 89/3 ex-wife [1] 88/4 exact [6] 37/18 40/10 44/3 44/5 46/7 46/18 exactly [6] 8/16 8/18 10/4 62/4 74/18 89/13 **examination [4]** 61/2 70/10 77/21 78/15 examinations [1] 84/4 **examine [3]** 11/12 52/9 83/12 **example [14]** 11/14 15/22 20/23 34/2 36/24 36/25 38/11 38/13 54/14 54/19 54/20 54/22 57/12 95/25 examples [2] 36/21 39/11 Excel [1] 48/18 except [1] 66/9 **exception [2]** 67/3 90/1

53/22 75/15 **exclude** [5] 12/19 28/12 44/20 67/5 74/1 **exclusion** [2] 27/21 28/6 **exculpatory** [16] 31/4 40/6 44/11 51/1 55/25 58/2 58/17 59/6 59/11 59/12 63/23 65/6 exports [2] 21/24 23/15 85/20 86/13 87/11 89/22 excuse [1] 46/24 **executing** [1] 54/13 **executions** [1] 11/21 **exercise** [1] 81/8 exhibit [20] 6/5 14/22 15/4 17/10 18/13 19/19 20/15 22/14 23/7 33/13 33/16 41/6 53/12 53/16 54/25 55/4 62/7 63/13 63/16 84/3 **exhibits [30]** 12/3 12/16 12/17 13/10 14/9 14/18 14/23 15/11 17/18 18/9 19/24 20/5 20/12 22/15 22/18 23/11 23/12 29/14 36/9 36/13 36/14 36/15 36/16 41/7 69/15 70/6 73/1 73/7 75/12 93/18 exist [3] 40/2 40/5 58/1 existed [1] 62/22 exists [3] 40/4 57/25 90/6 **expanded [2]** 11/19 11/21 **expected** [1] 80/21 **expenses** [1] 34/20 **experience** [8] 27/20 28/14 28/14 66/12 75/23 79/11 80/5 81/7 experienced [1] 44/14 **expert** [16] 11/11 35/5 37/19 41/4 41/5 48/6 64/10 66/8 66/10 66/10 66/13 71/16 95/6 95/14 95/16 96/1 expert's [1] 46/11 expert-signed [1] 66/10 experts [3] 75/13 75/16 76/25

Docum**enchange [4]** 6/4/20/12/27 in texplain [4] 16/6/6/1836/20 20/15 29/5 34/7 58/13 73/11 73/20 92/16 **explained** [1] 28/25 **explains [2]** 34/5 73/23 **explore** [1] 81/10 export [1] 23/10 **expounded** [1] 53/19 **EXPR** [7] 53/3 53/20 53/21 53/23 53/24 54/11 54/19 express [5] 42/6 42/17 46/14 82/4 82/23 **extend** [1] 33/22 **extension** [1] 13/8 **extent** [9] 6/19 21/23 37/6 58/13 59/11 61/4 81/8 84/16 90/19 external [2] 26/5 26/21 extraneous [3] 58/7 67/25 82/24 extraordinarily [3] 10/6 10/13 64/12 extraordinary [1] 66/11 **extreme** [1] 55/9 **extremely [2]** 29/22 73/21 eye [1] 16/16 **evewitness** [1] 88/10

fabricated [1] 41/8 face [1] 14/8 facing [4] 13/11 13/14 14/1 17/3 fact [21] 13/8 17/24 18/19 19/6 25/21 28/4 30/13 32/15 35/2 38/17 41/22 43/16 55/21 60/19 61/3 61/6 66/19 73/22 86/14 93/2 95/17 fact-intensive [1] 55/21 **factors** [5] 25/19 30/19 44/14 45/6 76/12 facts [10] 6/8 6/9 14/13 14/21 16/2 32/20 43/11 53/4 60/3 74/7

Docum 67/67381/24ed on 04/16/24 in \(\pi \) 68/3 68/4968/9268/33 F Case 4:22-cr-00612 68/17 72/16 72/25 81/12 **fight [5]** 12/18 78/20 78/21 fair [10] 5/11 14/11 45/1 78/21 78/22 five [6] 7/22 9/24 15/13 52/7 52/17 69/22 77/11 fights [2] 93/7 93/8 18/20 20/2 70/18 77/18 77/20 87/13 figure [1] 35/7 **five-month** [1] 15/13 **fairly** [1] 54/11 figured [1] 85/19 **flattering** [1] 86/23 **faithful** [1] 36/15 **figures** [1] 16/3 flavor [1] 10/24 fall [1] 47/2 flaws [1] 11/12 file [10] 9/16 12/18 33/21 false [11] 5/4 11/2 24/3 24/5 44/23 60/11 77/16 77/16 flesh [2] 12/25 13/18 24/9 24/10 27/24 28/8 37/16 **fleshing** [1] 78/24 91/13 92/8 92/11 37/20 40/19 flexible [1] 81/25 **filed [20]** 4/6 4/19 25/9 familiar [1] 95/22 27/14 28/24 30/24 33/12 **floor [3]** 1/23 2/14 81/16 family [1] 88/16 33/13 33/15 51/2 62/18 67/5 fluctuations [1] 76/11 far [6] 44/15 62/20 76/15 67/8 68/16 68/17 68/18 74/1 **focus [3]** 10/15 10/18 54/16 76/22 86/12 89/21 focused [2] 24/7 92/14 90/14 91/12 95/24 **fashion** [1] 69/17 files [6] 21/15 22/2 23/2 follow [3] 4/5 41/25 45/24 fast [1] 72/3 25/2 59/7 60/10 **follow-on [2]** 41/25 45/24 favor [1] 29/8 **filing [1]** 63/17 **followed [2]** 72/11 72/12 **favoring** [1] 32/19 followers [4] 25/24 26/1 filings [2] 43/4 51/2 **FBI [20]** 30/21 43/15 50/6 fill [1] 26/5 26/3 26/11 50/11 50/16 50/21 50/22 **final [5]** 30/7 66/9 95/9 96/2 **following [1]** 48/13 50/22 51/24 52/5 54/18 60/6 96/4 followings [1] 26/9 66/20 86/4 86/5 86/10 87/18 **financial** [5] 51/3 51/4 follows [3] 86/8 91/18 91/20 90/20 91/14 92/1 51/22 51/24 52/11 **fool** [1] 7/20 **FBI's [2]** 60/10 87/21 **find [9]** 19/13 20/8 26/5 **footnote** [1] 16/4 FCRR [1] 3/15 27/2 58/1 58/4 87/7 87/9 forced [2] 22/18 23/13 fear [1] 35/18 forces [1] 32/16 92/1 **February [5]** 41/23 46/23 **finding [3]** 6/13 40/10 67/8 forcing [1] 28/17 69/8 76/15 85/5 finding -- findings [1] **FORD [5]** 1/19 1/20 1/23 fed [1] 73/12 64/24 86/9 40/10 **federal [4]** 16/6 28/15 55/19 **findings** [1] 40/10 **foregoing** [1] 96/19 82/6 **fine** [6] 17/6 50/11 57/5 forensic [2] 21/18 21/20 feed [2] 72/6 72/8 77/18 80/20 91/3 forfeitable [1] 91/7 feedback [1] 69/8 fingers [1] 85/12 forgot [1] 72/22 feel [1] 47/2 **finished** [1] 15/13 **form [2]** 51/22 51/24 feeling [1] 18/22 **FINRA [9]** 64/8 64/10 former [2] 28/14 42/1 FERTITTA [4] 2/19 2/20 64/11 64/13 64/24 75/15 forth [1] 71/3 24/17 28/24 76/25 84/16 85/9 **foul** [1] 37/20 few [9] 13/21 18/10 19/12 fire [1] 35/1 found [4] 18/20 32/1 43/22 20/24 32/4 45/17 48/14 73/6 43/23 Firm [5] 2/3 2/6 2/17 2/20 82/20 foundational [1] 37/2 3/6 **field [2]** 40/17 60/4 four [8] 13/2 13/3 53/24 first [19] 10/15 11/3 11/6 **Fifth [4]** 38/7 67/12 67/17 15/12 18/10 39/12 40/15 54/17 70/18 75/24 80/15 81/24 43/19 51/20 54/22 59/10 93/12 Fifth Circuit [4] 38/7 67/12

Docume ilmore's #16 84/02/16/24 in +\$9/4 52/4 63/12 53/15 62/17 F Case 4:22-cr-00612 girlfriend [2] 88/5 89/14 62/19 63/1 63/4 64/8 64/10 **four-letter** [1] 70/18 give [11] 13/8 14/14 17/2 65/14 65/20 66/6 66/12 67/6 France [1] 88/3 26/20 27/4 49/1 58/18 65/22 67/7 67/9 67/11 67/21 70/23 **Franklin** [1] 2/14 65/23 87/20 93/14 75/11 75/22 76/2 76/4 77/7 frankly [6] 39/9 55/1 77/23 given [11] 14/9 14/13 14/24 79/20 81/7 82/11 83/20 84/9 79/24 80/13 92/16 16/19 18/6 26/19 36/6 36/16 86/3 86/18 87/20 87/22 fraud [11] 11/3 11/9 40/18 60/14 78/9 84/15 88/20 91/5 91/9 94/15 94/20 67/15 73/16 73/16 73/17 giving [3] 36/9 57/24 80/15 95/2 95/8 73/17 75/18 83/21 91/10 government -- from [1] **glossed** [1] 55/8 **freedom** [1] 5/9 21/6 go -- I [1] 86/16 Friday [1] 79/7 **go -- to [1]** 10/23 government -- the [1] 50/4 front [3] 31/13 45/22 46/19 goes [9] 11/6 30/25 39/1 **government's [44]** 6/11 fruit [1] 39/10 47/15 50/21 51/12 73/19 6/19 6/20 6/23 7/17 10/1 **fruition [1]** 16/21 73/20 87/10 11/11 11/15 12/5 12/17 14/9 full [1] 35/15 16/9 17/10 18/9 19/19 19/24 going [127] full-time [1] 35/15 going -- I'll [1] 47/4 20/17 20/24 21/7 22/25 23/7 fundamental [1] 85/1 **gold** [1] 87/20 23/11 25/8 25/12 26/7 26/10 future [2] 7/7 8/25 **Goldman** [1] 8/1 26/23 27/8 27/9 27/19 27/25 G **gone** [2] 16/7 36/12 30/15 31/17 41/4 42/19 50/5 **good [13]** 14/6 19/10 24/16 51/2 51/12 59/3 63/2 70/8 gain [1] 32/7 game [8] 15/12 52/7 52/17 31/12 32/8 32/10 32/15 70/21 71/5 80/19 32/15 35/23 38/12 46/24 government's -- we're [1] 73/23 77/11 77/18 77/20 54/2 77/21 10/187/13 grab [1] 20/1 got [28] 6/13 14/23 18/11 **GameStop [4]** 42/6 42/12 grabbed [1] 37/13 20/1 23/11 23/23 26/13 57/8 57/17 34/18 35/14 44/18 44/19 grabs [1] 20/2 gap [1] 26/1 grand [3] 47/14 47/15 50/17 48/3 49/24 50/4 57/10 57/16 gaps [1] 26/6 grant [3] 61/10 78/23 86/20 60/19 64/17 67/13 68/22 Garibotti [2] 11/10 71/17 granting [4] 61/9 61/10 75/2 76/4 81/14 87/6 88/5 **Garibotti's** [1] 73/12 88/6 89/14 93/16 69/1 88/24 Gary [3] 24/17 42/3 46/18 **gotten [5]** 64/11 64/11 gravamen [2] 14/18 39/4 gave [3] 48/5 86/16 87/17 great [7] 7/10 7/14 35/8 65/13 65/19 65/24 Gee [1] 82/25 government [89] 4/17 4/25 48/11 72/6 81/18 91/23 general [3] 31/20 38/25 5/25 10/14 10/19 13/10 greatly [1] 15/17 47/24 14/17 15/5 15/11 17/10 grew [1] 79/20 **generally** [1] 79/16 17/24 21/6 21/9 21/19 21/23 ground [1] 11/23 Gensler [2] 42/3 46/18 **grouped** [1] 4/8 22/7 22/10 23/12 23/16 **gentlemen** [1] 45/3 **guarantee** [1] 84/22 23/18 24/9 27/21 27/23 28/5 **germane** [1] 18/4 guess [4] 9/2 18/24 68/9 gets [4] 61/5 64/14 79/8 28/7 28/17 28/20 31/6 31/25 33/2 33/2 33/7 33/15 33/23 86/25 79/19 guilty [2] 73/16 73/17 33/25 34/11 34/24 35/4 getting [4] 34/22 64/2 74/13 35/22 41/8 41/9 43/12 43/20 **guru [1]** 38/23 78/9 44/20 45/2 46/23 48/16 50/2 **guy [2]** 38/12 64/21 **Giglio** [1] 60/19

GCase 4:22-cr-00612 guys [12] 6/7 31/2 31/3 43/1 44/6 44/21 48/22 63/15 75/17 76/11 91/15 92/8 **GX1** [1] 73/1 H

H-O-F-V [1] 46/14 Hale [3] 60/5 60/5 60/9 **half [7]** 8/6 20/20 36/11 44/24 71/23 71/24 83/16 **HALPIN** [1] 1/19 hand [5] 19/5 82/22 87/16 87/17 92/4 handed [3] 14/16 17/8 53/14 handful [2] 42/16 82/19 handle [1] 63/24 handling [1] 24/19 hands [1] 31/6 HANEN [1] 1/8 hanging [4] 4/22 88/3 88/4 89/13 happen [8] 26/3 42/7 42/8 57/13 61/3 70/8 77/9 91/23 happened [6] 10/5 29/12 46/23 77/20 87/24 91/25 happening [2] 87/9 88/11 happens [1] 18/24 happy [2] 9/16 37/24 hard [7] 15/16 24/22 26/2 45/16 74/2 85/23 91/17 **hard-pressed** [1] 45/16 HARLAN [1] 2/9 harm [1] 31/4 harmed [1] 72/18 hash [1] 81/20 hasn't [1] 24/2 haste [3] 33/6 33/11 33/23 hastily [1] 12/24 hate [5] 79/20 80/10 80/11 80/12 93/12 hates [2] 81/15 93/10 have [246]

Docum**leave** 63 maked 1 h 32/16824 in +48/10 56/25 81/18 93/17 have -- they [1] 9/9 haven't [13] 13/19 31/5 36/12 36/13 57/23 61/13 64/11 65/4 65/19 67/3 74/19 78/8 93/23 haven't -- you [1] 57/23 having [8] 29/17 50/11 52/19 55/5 76/25 77/17 81/10 91/16 **he [83]** 4/7 4/21 11/7 11/9 11/9 12/13 18/21 19/4 19/4 19/4 19/5 21/10 24/2 24/9 24/10 25/10 25/11 25/24 25/24 25/25 28/13 31/21 32/3 32/5 32/6 32/13 32/14 32/17 32/19 32/23 32/24 33/4 34/23 35/1 35/5 35/10 40/13 42/16 42/16 42/17 44/16 45/18 45/18 45/22 46/19 47/23 47/24 48/11 48/11 48/12 48/13 48/14 51/23 51/23 51/23 53/21 53/22 59/9 59/12 60/9 60/12 60/14 60/19 62/16 62/18 63/7 63/7 72/13 72/14 72/14 72/15 83/6 83/7 86/19 87/17 87/17 87/23 88/17 88/17 90/9 90/19 90/23 94/3 he's [16] 11/4 11/6 12/12 18/20 18/22 18/24 18/25 32/2 32/7 32/9 41/16 60/20 62/16 67/8 88/1 90/20 head [4] 8/17 71/16 73/6 86/6 headed [1] 24/13 hear [13] 4/17 5/16 30/16 37/23 40/16 57/3 57/23 57/24 59/10 65/6 74/11 84/14 85/9 heard [6] 29/2 29/5 36/21 39/14 87/22 92/4 hearing [11] 1/8 36/17 36/18 41/24 46/5 46/17

93/21 hearings [2] 93/5 93/15 hearsay [1] 37/5 **Heather [2]** 3/15 96/23 **Heights [3]** 2/6 2/17 2/20 held [1] 45/19 help [4] 78/22 81/7 84/5 84/6 **helpful [3]** 33/20 33/25 79/3 helping [1] 85/12 helps [1] 89/1 **HENNESSEY** [6] 3/8 4/19 4/20 5/7 5/12 49/15 Hennessey's [4] 12/4 33/10 68/7 69/1 **her [4]** 11/12 11/12 38/20 49/1 her -- the [1] 11/12 Herculean [2] 17/22 27/13 here [39] 4/3 10/1 10/21 12/21 13/14 13/24 14/20 17/9 24/19 31/13 36/1 36/14 37/22 39/6 40/11 40/25 41/1 42/9 42/12 44/19 47/16 50/1 55/2 57/20 64/7 64/18 67/19 69/12 70/18 77/13 77/24 78/4 79/10 81/23 83/14 85/20 86/7 87/9 92/2 here -- yeah -- both [1] 67/19 here's [13] 10/3 24/25 41/10 41/11 56/23 61/8 70/20 77/8 77/8 79/12 91/12 91/13 91/14 here's -- here's [1] 77/8 herself [1] 11/11 **hesitation** [1] 16/15 hey [3] 41/10 75/16 87/23 **HEYWARD [1]** 1/15 high [2] 8/16 40/3 higher [2] 25/18 32/5 highlighted [1] 23/23 highly [1] 40/6

Docum 3/17 3/3 0 3/11/2060/404/16/24 in tidea [3] 5/14/19/27/20863/15 **H** Case 4:22-cr-00612 **identical** [1] 31/22 how -- you [1] 92/25 HILDER [2] 2/9 2/10 however [3] 23/11 41/6 identified [2] 15/8 28/8 him [12] 4/8 4/22 15/1 identify [1] 27/23 52/11 32/11 32/16 33/21 60/18 **HOXIE** [1] 1/22 **Ides** [1] 81/19 72/13 83/14 86/19 90/21 Hoyt [1] 80/2 **III** [1] 1/19 94/13 HRVATIN [11] 2/22 31/13 illegal [1] 50/13 his [33] 4/7 4/20 4/24 5/9 illustrate [2] 17/13 18/12 31/21 32/1 32/12 33/20 14/22 14/24 14/25 15/19 34/25 53/18 53/23 54/5 54/9 | illustration [1] | 14/10 16/4 16/8 17/3 17/12 18/22 **Hrvatin's** [1] 54/2 **imagine** [1] 70/10 18/23 28/25 32/13 32/18 huge [5] 11/16 12/7 14/8 **immediately** [1] 19/14 32/24 35/9 35/18 36/24 impact [1] 26/16 27/11 45/19 36/25 40/13 52/20 60/15 **hundred** [3] 18/10 45/17 impactful [2] 19/6 80/22 60/22 86/4 88/10 88/17 90/4 51/17 **importance** [1] 76/18 91/6 91/9 94/4 husband [1] 60/14 important [21] 6/22 8/13 his -- he [1] 4/7 8/14 9/13 10/6 10/8 21/14 **hyperbolic** [1] 17/23 **historically [1]** 40/17 29/12 29/22 40/9 48/23 51/8 **history** [1] 16/19 51/25 53/4 60/3 64/12 72/16 **hit** [1] 11/4 I -- as [1] 34/16 77/22 83/12 93/19 94/9 hoe [1] 74/3 I -- I [4] 57/20 67/11 77/8 impossible [3] 47/22 47/22 hold [5] 21/11 72/15 73/22 85/6 84/24 91/19 93/4 I -- I'll [2] 25/11 46/10 impossible -- impossible [1] **holding [3]** 7/5 34/3 34/5 I -- I'm [2] 57/2 61/18 47/22 holds [1] 67/13 I -- it [1] 34/15 **imputing** [1] 70/5 hole [1] 61/5 I -- it's -- it's [1] 86/4 inappropriate [1] 66/16 holidays [1] 16/21 I -- what [1] 80/4 **incidents** [1] 26/18 home [1] 32/18 I -- you [1] 10/11 inclined [1] 85/10 Honor [110] I'd [4] 40/8 48/19 48/20 include [4] 19/20 37/19 **Honor's [4]** 16/8 65/6 84/15 78/9 64/25 73/8 85/24 **I'll [16]** 4/18 10/4 25/11 included [3] 14/18 20/4 **HONORABLE** [1] 1/8 25/11 29/1 35/15 40/12 26/7 hook [1] 37/2 46/10 47/4 64/25 79/24 includes [1] 90/18 hope [1] 48/25 89/15 92/12 93/3 93/4 95/22 including [2] 51/22 59/1 hopes [1] 89/1 I'm [121] income [2] 35/9 35/9 hoping [1] 85/4 I'm -- I [2] 4/12 78/23 inconsistent [4] 7/21 8/5 9/5 horse [1] 16/25 I'm -- I'm [3] 68/25 78/24 91/8 hour [4] 16/23 32/8 34/21 80/24 incorrect [2] 32/16 38/6 77/13 I'm -- there [1] 69/6 increases [2] 41/22 44/14 hours [6] 6/25 17/20 17/20 I've [29] 4/5 6/2 6/5 9/23 **incredible [1]** 14/12 18/18 25/6 25/7 13/4 14/23 14/25 18/11 25/5 **incredibly** [1] 20/14 hours' [2] 71/2 71/3 34/18 35/12 39/14 46/5 46/6 inculpatory [3] 63/24 86/14 house [2] 63/11 88/22 47/14 68/24 69/13 80/5 89/22 houses [1] 87/25 83/11 83/11 83/14 83/14 **incumbent** [1] 19/1 **HOUSTON [12]** 1/2 1/17 83/16 84/23 86/11 86/12 independently [1] 33/4 2/7 2/11 2/18 2/21 2/24 3/4 89/21 90/5 96/15

Docum**ienterviews 16d** 6464/16/24 in TASB Case 4:22-cr-00612 indeterminate [1] 41/22 **indicate** [1] 67/19 indicating [1] 87/5 **indicative** [1] 17/22 indicted [3] 5/5 18/21 44/6 indictment [24] 4/22 5/1 5/2 5/3 5/8 9/23 10/23 13/19 25/16 25/24 27/22 28/6 28/8 28/10 42/22 42/24 43/2 45/9 57/2 58/6 59/3 68/18 82/13 83/1 individual [4] 31/24 40/22 67/4 79/16 **individuals** [1] 69/17 **information** [21] 22/11 25/20 30/16 34/21 43/19 44/11 50/4 51/10 51/21 55/10 56/13 58/24 59/1 59/2 59/6 60/19 60/22 61/4 82/24 94/5 94/10 informs [1] 8/16 **inside [3]** 8/16 34/5 58/15 insider [2] 40/19 40/20 insiders [1] 64/20 instance [3] 22/13 63/6 63/10 instruments [1] 44/3 **intangible** [1] 67/14 **integrity** [1] 34/24 intelligent [1] 36/2 intelligently [1] 18/15 **intensive** [1] 55/21 intent [6] 7/9 7/12 8/11 9/12 63/16 73/20 interchanged [1] 23/24 interested [2] 32/13 89/12 **interject** [1] 58/19 interjection [1] 58/20 intermingled [1] 23/25 **Internet [3]** 6/14 37/5 37/14 **intervals** [1] 10/7 intervening [1] 39/1 **interview** [1] 33/21

introduce [3] 36/23 55/6 74/5 invested [1] 50/16 investigate [2] 50/5 64/13 investigated [3] 44/13 44/24 51/11 investigation [12] 30/21 43/15 44/2 51/10 51/12 51/13 52/17 57/16 58/16 59/1 60/13 87/12 investigative [3] 50/5 50/9 51/5 investigatory [1] 44/23 **investing** [1] 6/15 **investors** [1] 7/25 involved [7] 24/8 26/8 29/3 43/15 47/25 60/16 64/19 **involvement** [1] 64/16 **involves** [1] 65/4 involving [2] 50/13 65/7 irreconcilable [1] 38/9 **irrelevant** [1] 36/19 **IRS** [5] 47/8 62/18 63/3 63/25 64/2 is -- does [1] 7/11 is -- I [2] 83/22 86/21 is -- is [1] 43/12 is -- trades [1] 33/4 is -- when [1] 21/19 isn't [4] 19/20 24/4 29/16 82/15 issue [48] 10/10 14/8 19/16 22/6 22/8 24/7 27/1 29/5 37/25 38/18 40/14 41/17 42/5 42/9 42/12 43/8 43/13 44/18 46/7 49/23 49/25 54/18 56/7 56/7 59/15 59/24 59/25 65/3 65/12 65/24 66/5 66/21 69/11 75/10 76/3 76/3 83/24 84/8 86/4 86/10 86/11 88/15 88/17 92/23 93/22 94/2 94/2 96/6 issued [4] 40/19 44/2 47/6

Page 113 of 133 issues [35] 12/3 12/20 12/25 13/9 13/15 13/18 19/12 20/19 22/12 28/5 36/2 36/2 36/3 36/3 36/4 36/5 36/7 37/6 37/22 39/3 39/11 40/1 60/9 65/2 68/22 70/1 70/2 72/24 75/5 81/20 81/22 85/1 87/7 92/12 93/20 it -- I [1] 89/18 It'll [1] 93/14 it's -- I [2] 56/9 78/12 it's -- if [1] 52/5 it's -- it's [1] 12/15 it's -- that's [1] 79/10 It's -- yeah [1] 75/7 item [1] 33/14 its [8] 11/4 19/19 23/12 50/6 59/1 59/4 70/9 71/5 itself [2] 31/6 60/11

J

J-A-G-X [1] 46/13 **Jackson [2]** 3/9 3/12 **JAGX [2]** 42/6 46/13 jail [1] 87/23 **JAMES** [1] 3/12 **JAMIE [2]** 1/22 19/11 **January [5]** 42/14 42/14 46/23 51/3 53/22 January -- between [1] 42/14 **January 25th [1]** 53/22 **January 31st [1]** 51/3 **Jencks [3]** 28/13 95/6 96/1 **Jenks [4]** 66/14 95/10 95/14 95/17 Jenks-qualified [1] 66/14 **jeopardy [2]** 13/15 35/20 **job [3]** 8/2 11/11 20/14 **JOHN [1]** 1/12 joined [2] 28/24 30/11 joint [5] 30/20 43/15 67/9 79/5 81/5 jointly [2] 27/14 44/1

joking [1] 75/20 Journal [1] 57/14 judge [16] 1/9 5/18 7/4 8/21 14/14 58/14 66/9 67/18 80/2 80/2 81/2 81/12 84/20 92/3 92/20 96/8 judge thank [1] 14/14 Judge Gilmore's [1] 81/12 Judge Hoyt [1] 80/2 Judge-approved [1] 66/9 judicial [1] 16/2 juice [1] 53/25 July [2] 30/24 35/13 June [5] 5/4 27/23 34/3 37/21 83/4 June 5th [1] 34/3 jurisprudence [1] 17/5 juror's [1] 70/6 jurors [3] 79/16 79/18 80/6 jury [22] 6/9 10/24 19/2 29/16 30/16 31/7 31/16 31/18 45/22 47/15 48/17 69/24 69/24 73/18 75/3 79/5 79/6 79/10 80/7 80/9 80/22 93/10 jury's [1] 75/9 just [88] 10/18 11/4 11/19 12/9 13/2 13/8 13/19 13/21 14/7 15/23 17/14 19/12 20/4 25/11 28/21 28/25 29/12 29/14 32/5 33/24 34/19 36/1 36/18 36/21 36/23 36/25 37/3 38/13 40/13 41/15 45/14 49/22 53/3 53/3 53/20 54/14 54/14 54/21 56/20	74/20 77/5 78/6 92/3 kindly [3] 16/4 31/25 33/15 knew [5] 24/4 24/6 35/16 52/15 72/13 know [123] know it [1] 10/18 knowledge [2] 57/14 61/2 known [3] 14/25 72/14 83/11 knows [8] 15/15 36/23 37/4 77/16 93/16 93/18 93/20 93/20 Koss [1] 46/14 Kyles [2] 51/14 87/11 L L.L.P [1] 2/23 lack [3] 34/24 51/10 71/16 Landy [2] 1/20 1/23	latter [1] 93/18 laundering [1] 91/7 laundry [1] 89/19 LAURA [4] 3/9 4/18 81/11 83/15 law [22] 2/3 2/6 2/17 2/20 3/3 3/6 35/11 35/20 38/6 38/6 38/24 50/22 60/19 66/16 67/12 67/13 86/5 87/8 87/18 88/16 95/11 95/25 laws [1] 18/4 lawyer [4] 18/2 18/3 18/5 86/11 lawyer's [1] 80/14 lawyers [9] 33/11 34/20 49/3 74/6 75/1 80/10 82/22 83/16 86/3 lay [2] 15/24 82/22 lead [4] 4/16 21/7 64/10 74/25 leading [1] 67/17 leads [2] 60/6 88/14 learn [5] 6/9 31/16 31/17 35/17 43/11 learning [1] 18/3 least [18] 9/4 19/14 21/4 22/20 30/4 32/21 34/12 43/25 44/12 49/6 52/12 53/6 53/6 64/23 83/16 87/15 88/6 89/21 leave [1] 89/15 leaving [1] 12/7 left [4] 22/11 36/14 56/10 70/12 legal [2] 61/7 74/3 length [5] 23/21 53/20 82/5
12/9 13/2 13/8 13/19 13/21 14/7 15/23 17/14 19/12 20/4 25/11 28/21 28/25 29/12 29/14 32/5 33/24 34/19 36/1 36/18 36/21 36/23 36/25 37/3 38/13 40/13 41/15 45/14 49/22 53/3 53/3 53/20	93/20 Koss [1] 46/14 Kyles [2] 51/14 87/11 L L.L.P [1] 2/23 lack [3] 34/24 51/10 71/16	89/21 leave [1] 89/15 leaving [1] 12/7 left [4] 22/11 36/14 56/10 70/12 legal [2] 61/7 74/3

Case 4:22-cr-00612 let... [5] 83/1 86/2 86/7 92/2 96/6 let's [15] 4/10 4/15 37/25 39/13 39/23 39/24 52/22 53/3 54/16 55/11 64/3 74/6 79/6 92/1 94/21 **letter [3]** 20/25 34/7 70/18 letters [1] 42/2 level [1] 8/22 **LEWIS [5]** 3/2 36/25 83/13 94/2 94/11 Lewis's [1] 25/22 **lied** [1] 6/16 life [2] 17/3 81/13 like [32] 11/4 11/15 11/17 11/22 11/23 12/2 12/11 13/16 13/19 17/17 19/12 19/25 22/6 34/18 38/14 40/8 48/20 48/20 52/13 53/21 61/24 63/21 64/1 64/20 65/17 65/17 77/24 81/14 81/19 84/1 89/13 90/21 like -- there's [1] 12/2 like -- they're [1] 65/17 limine [6] 11/1 11/15 12/2 45/25 61/1 84/1 **limit [3]** 32/9 85/10 85/18 limitation [1] 5/9 line [3] 20/8 22/21 48/21 lining [1] 19/17 **LIOLOS** [1] 1/12 list [16] 19/19 22/14 23/7 24/5 33/13 33/16 41/6 42/18 46/4 46/15 52/11 52/12 53/16 63/13 63/16 71/16 listed [5] 42/19 42/20 43/2 59/4 64/18 listen [1] 69/25 **listened** [1] 72/7 **listening** [1] 36/1 listens [1] 16/25 lists [5] 6/6 54/25 55/4 62/7 84/3

literally [3] 48/17 48/17 81/13 literally -- literally [1] 48/17 **litigation** [1] 35/17 little [10] 4/3 37/21 41/11 53/4 61/19 65/14 65/19 72/24 77/5 87/19 lived [1] 87/24 living [1] 32/18 **LLP [5]** 1/20 1/23 2/13 3/9 3/12 lock [2] 8/3 9/4 locked [1] 11/11 **locking** [1] 8/7 long [15] 7/25 13/25 35/2 69/11 71/4 71/10 75/3 75/25 76/23 78/7 80/5 83/11 85/12 88/17 90/17 long-term [1] 7/25 longer [3] 5/7 27/22 28/17 look [30] 8/23 11/16 11/17 11/22 12/11 14/22 16/5 19/3 21/20 22/1 22/13 22/18 24/8 26/21 34/12 47/23 48/10 48/12 48/17 48/22 68/22 70/6 75/17 77/19 79/9 79/13 83/8 87/15 91/22 96/6 looked [6] 13/2 41/21 62/21 69/13 70/24 72/6 **looking [6]** 12/9 16/15 58/23 70/1 75/2 75/25 looks [2] 22/6 52/13 losing [1] 67/14 loss [4] 31/24 44/22 67/14 83/24 losses [2] 40/24 41/3 lost [4] 41/13 55/1 64/1 72/7 **lot [31]** 4/4 5/24 8/23 12/20 13/18 16/8 18/3 26/9 26/25 27/2 27/10 29/2 35/25 36/17 37/6 39/9 42/8 52/3 53/2 53/4 56/4 64/11 71/13 72/1

| Docume | Interest | 1 | Filed on 04/16/24 in | 79/11 | 81/13 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 | 1/16 |

M

ma'am [1] 14/15 made [39] 14/7 15/3 15/6 15/19 18/21 19/4 19/19 20/17 27/7 29/24 31/1 32/7 35/8 41/3 41/18 42/13 42/15 42/16 42/17 42/17 45/2 45/3 45/5 45/18 45/22 46/10 50/17 52/3 56/4 73/15 75/17 77/1 78/5 86/18 86/18 86/19 87/17 88/19 94/5 **Madison** [1] 1/23 magistrate [1] 66/9 magistrate's [1] 35/14 mail [8] 21/6 21/9 34/10 66/7 66/13 90/18 95/9 95/13 mailed [1] 34/4 mails [7] 33/14 33/17 59/7 90/1 90/8 95/5 95/16 main [2] 72/12 73/2 maintain [1] 5/14 major [2] 43/8 93/4 majority [3] 19/24 45/4 45/5 make [31] 5/7 7/16 10/7 11/16 11/22 12/6 13/10 14/24 16/23 18/13 18/16 21/25 23/17 29/1 29/18 32/6 32/18 35/15 44/18 44/19 61/15 65/21 73/18 77/7 78/21 80/21 85/8 88/16 89/24 92/18 95/4

MCase 4:22-cr-00612 makes [7] 18/16 20/13 20/18 33/7 33/11 33/23 34/11 making [6] 6/13 12/11 27/22 31/23 56/25 71/18 MALLETT [3] 2/23 2/23 31/12 malpractice [1] 10/18 man [3] 17/2 54/8 57/9 manager [2] 14/3 16/5 manipulation [2] 64/13 64/20 manner [3] 43/8 73/21 80/17 many [11] 12/18 13/25 16/11 26/11 43/23 45/6 45/6 46/25 63/7 83/20 84/8 **March [6]** 15/13 37/18 42/15 81/19 84/2 92/25 March 1st [1] 42/15 margins [1] 35/3 **MARIE** [1] 3/9 marital [1] 87/9 market [16] 8/3 8/20 9/6 25/8 25/13 25/19 25/20 26/2 26/4 26/14 26/16 26/21 26/22 31/3 32/10 32/16 market -- these [1] 26/4 Massachusetts [1] 2/14 massive [4] 5/22 22/19 24/23 65/16 master [1] 17/23 match [1] 73/6 material [25] 21/1 23/10 26/7 28/13 30/9 30/12 34/7 37/3 40/5 40/9 49/2 50/2 51/14 51/19 51/20 52/1 53/6 56/8 58/14 58/15 59/11 59/12 87/24 94/8 95/7 materiality [1] 72/1 materials [7] 21/1 34/22 35/5 43/20 66/16 66/18 95/18

Documentation 2/4127244n mechanical lille 3/2433 28/23 47/20 49/12 matter [6] 17/24 23/9 51/11 meet [2] 13/10 33/11 73/13 73/14 96/20 matters [2] 19/18 22/3 **MATTHEW [1]** 1/19 Maxine [2] 41/23 46/16 may [48] 5/18 6/7 14/4 14/5 19/8 19/9 26/8 30/14 31/10 31/11 32/16 34/15 35/4 46/12 53/12 55/20 55/20 57/25 58/19 62/13 63/22 63/23 64/2 64/2 69/18 80/1 81/3 82/1 82/2 82/15 82/16 84/2 84/6 84/12 84/18 85/2 85/2 85/3 85/3 85/7 91/24 92/25 93/1 93/2 93/14 93/15 93/19 93/21 may -- may [1] 64/2 maybe [10] 6/18 39/15 57/25 69/6 70/4 70/4 75/25 86/15 86/25 92/6 MCGUIRE [1] 2/10 **McKinney** [2] 3/6 3/10 me -- and [1] 6/6 me -- I [1] 86/2 me -- let [2] 69/19 77/4 mean [57] 4/10 4/11 4/16 6/8 6/16 6/21 6/22 12/5 12/15 13/15 13/18 19/23 21/18 32/15 57/3 58/12 63/14 63/25 64/2 67/12 69/15 69/21 70/5 70/7 70/16 70/20 71/3 71/4 71/11 71/14 72/8 73/15 74/3 74/5 74/20 75/1 75/2 77/9 77/10 78/3 78/15 78/19 78/23 79/10 79/24 80/11 83/22 86/15 86/17 86/21 89/10 89/18 91/22 91/23 92/5 93/7 93/9 **Meaning [1]** 19/22 means [3] 21/17 31/21 60/11 measure [1] 16/14

media [1] 36/8 megabytes [1] 65/17 Melley [1] 64/10 members [1] 25/10 meme [11] 41/11 41/21 42/5 42/18 44/8 45/6 45/19 46/3 46/16 54/20 58/25 **Memorial** [2] 2/24 83/9 memorialize [1] 90/20 memorialized [1] 90/1 memory [1] 67/18 mention [2] 30/7 77/4 mentioned [4] 45/9 70/17 81/4 95/1 merits [1] 77/22 message [7] 12/7 20/2 20/3 53/17 88/7 88/9 89/12 messages [9] 12/5 14/19 17/12 18/8 19/17 19/17 73/7 74/15 74/16 methodology [1] 73/11 **MICHAEL** [1] 3/12 microphone [4] 58/22 75/6 75/7 87/5 **Microsoft** [1] 8/14 mid [1] 5/4 mid-June [1] 5/4 middle [1] 70/14 might [3] 7/15 61/15 79/4 million [11] 11/3 41/18 41/20 42/14 42/15 42/20 45/3 45/3 45/15 45/22 48/3 millions [4] 20/6 20/6 48/17 48/18 mind [6] 46/22 55/4 69/21 74/8 80/15 93/6 mindful [1] 31/15 minute [9] 8/9 9/5 10/5 10/5 49/20 57/7 66/23 74/5 77/17 minutes [4] 7/22 18/18 18/24 32/4 misleading [2] 20/15 48/15

Document/6031/196366 32/263249n + \$3/23 54625414 541554/7 MCase 4:22-cr-00612 33/10 33/10 33/16 33/21 54/9 54/20 60/13 60/23 63/6 misled [1] 72/17 34/17 38/2 39/20 40/9 41/17 63/8 63/20 64/21 64/24 65/2 missed [3] 51/5 51/5 52/14 54/25 61/1 61/9 61/10 66/4 67/5 67/23 68/7 69/1 69/19 missing [5] 6/7 25/12 26/23 67/5 67/9 67/25 68/6 68/7 71/4 75/22 82/15 82/18 39/25 65/7 68/13 68/13 68/19 68/21 83/13 86/3 86/8 86/9 86/25 missing -- and [1] 6/7 68/25 68/25 69/1 69/2 74/1 88/10 90/9 93/25 94/2 94/4 mistake [2] 33/15 33/17 74/10 77/6 82/9 83/23 84/10 94/11 95/19 mistakes [1] 34/11 Mr. Alt [1] 64/21 86/4 86/18 86/23 88/19 Mitchell [1] 4/19 **Mr. Armstrong** [13] 39/24 91/13 92/9 92/16 93/23 mode [1] 82/7 93/23 94/24 40/13 41/15 48/10 52/24 **Mole [1]** 10/2 motions [19] 4/13 11/1 63/20 65/2 67/23 69/19 71/4 moment [1] 22/9 11/15 12/1 12/19 12/19 30/8 86/8 93/25 95/19 money [21] 10/7 35/8 41/3 32/25 39/16 39/18 40/5 Mr. Carter [3] 53/1 86/25 41/13 45/18 45/20 46/10 66/24 67/3 67/4 67/24 68/10 90/9 50/9 50/10 50/12 52/3 52/4 68/16 69/2 84/1 Mr. Constantinescu [11] 52/4 73/15 87/18 88/1 88/15 motions -- there's [1] 68/10 41/18 45/7 53/17 53/20 91/6 91/6 91/7 91/9 motive [1] 73/19 53/23 54/4 54/7 60/13 60/23 **monitor** [1] 5/8 **move** [5] 26/2 31/3 45/25 63/8 88/10 month [15] 13/8 15/13 75/9 85/3 Mr. Constantinescu's [5] 29/13 75/2 75/25 76/9 76/13 moved [1] 79/21 29/21 30/10 39/18 54/20 76/23 80/23 80/25 83/6 84/5 **movement [3]** 7/13 7/19 86/3 91/4 94/14 94/21 57/9 **Mr. Cooperman [6]** 16/17 months [14] 10/21 10/22 17/2 27/14 49/10 63/6 94/4 **movements** [3] 8/3 8/10 13/2 13/3 13/6 13/21 20/21 76/11 **Mr. Cooperman's [1]** 36/24 24/21 27/23 36/11 69/5 76/1 moves [1] 32/10 Mr. Deel [1] 29/1 76/1 80/15 moving [1] 25/21 Mr. Fertitta [1] 28/24 months' [1] 13/25 MR [19] 1/12 1/12 1/15 **Mr. Ford [2]** 64/24 86/9 monumental [1] 15/5 1/19 1/19 2/2 2/5 2/9 2/9 **Mr. Hennessey [4]** 4/20 5/7 moon [1] 46/25 2/13 2/16 2/19 2/23 3/2 3/5 5/12 49/15 more [13] 9/23 19/12 20/19 Mr. Hennessey's [3] 12/4 3/12 39/18 49/14 53/18 20/19 22/11 22/12 24/25 **Mr. [91]** 4/6 4/6 4/20 5/7 68/7 69/1 27/21 30/10 35/8 41/2 53/25 Mr. Hrvatin [9] 31/21 32/1 5/12 5/21 10/12 12/4 14/7 85/11 15/2 15/24 16/3 16/3 16/17 32/12 33/20 34/25 53/18 morning [9] 6/24 12/9 14/6 17/2 18/17 23/22 25/22 53/23 54/5 54/9 16/5 19/10 24/16 31/12 27/14 27/14 28/22 28/24 Mr. Hrvatin's [1] 54/2 35/23 36/21 29/1 29/21 30/9 30/10 31/13 Mr. Lay [1] 15/24 most [14] 7/18 13/4 17/4 31/21 32/1 32/12 33/20 Mr. Lewis [4] 36/25 83/13 32/17 33/25 38/8 38/15 94/2 94/11 34/25 36/22 36/24 36/25 39/16 39/16 40/8 80/6 84/25 Mr. Lewis's [1] 25/22 39/15 39/18 39/24 40/13 85/19 93/19 41/15 41/18 45/7 45/12 Mr. Matlock [1] 27/14 most -- you [1] 39/16 Mr. O'Brien [1] 30/9 48/10 49/10 49/13 49/15 **motion [60]** 1/8 4/13 4/14 Mr. Perry [1] 28/22 52/24 53/1 53/17 53/18 4/19 10/12 12/4 24/17 28/6 53/19 53/19 53/20 53/23 Mr. Rosen [6] 14/7 16/3 28/24 30/11 30/18 30/24

Docum 33/6734/F76764764764724 in +89/19 93/3e 118 of 133 MCase 4:22-cr-00612 40/7 41/1 41/10 42/13 42/15 | **need -- we [1]** 21/22 Mr. Rosen... [4] 18/17 43/8 43/11 44/12 44/15 45/2 | needs [4] 24/15 32/21 56/8 23/22 36/22 75/22 45/5 45/15 46/4 46/10 47/12 84/9 Mr. Rosen's [1] 15/2 47/23 50/13 50/20 50/22 negotiating [1] 80/1 **Mr. Rybarczyk [5]** 4/6 5/21 neighborhood [1] 72/2 52/19 56/10 56/10 64/18 49/13 82/15 82/18 **never** [7] 9/23 9/23 17/3 64/25 66/11 67/2 67/18 **Mr. Rybarczyk's [1]** 45/12 69/21 71/16 72/7 72/16 73/6 28/7 32/12 34/11 57/23 **Mr. Stefan** [1] 31/13 75/22 78/16 79/11 80/5 81/7 **new [7]** 1/13 1/24 1/24 **Mr. Williams [3]** 4/6 16/3 81/13 81/15 82/9 82/16 84/7 19/11 22/10 22/11 92/23 39/15 newspaper [1] 40/25 84/7 84/9 84/15 87/14 88/1 **Mr. Williams' [1]** 10/12 next [3] 47/5 48/14 84/15 88/15 Mrs. [1] 15/9 My -- I [1] 7/6 nice [1] 4/8 Mrs. Epley [1] 15/9 myself [1] 15/11 **night** [3] 10/12 13/3 73/4 **MS [3]** 1/22 2/10 3/9 night's [1] 16/4 N **Ms.** [11] 27/16 37/15 38/2 nine [1] 36/15 40/7 47/5 48/24 68/9 69/4 N-A-K-D [1] 46/13 **ninth** [1] 81/16 71/17 73/12 86/9 nailed [1] 7/3 **no [39]** 1/4 8/12 8/13 16/15 Ms. Cordova [4] 27/16 38/2 **NAKD** [4] 42/6 42/13 42/16 16/17 16/20 17/17 18/5 39/8 68/9 69/4 46/10 39/8 39/17 40/24 40/24 41/2 Ms. Cordova's [1] 37/15 name [4] 19/10 41/1 50/21 41/19 42/13 43/9 43/13 **Ms. Garibotti** [1] 71/17 78/16 43/13 44/22 44/22 49/10 **Ms. Garibotti's** [1] 73/12 naming [1] 46/9 49/12 49/13 49/14 49/15 **Ms. Solano [3]** 40/7 47/5 narrow [3] 10/22 13/23 49/16 51/19 55/11 57/20 86/9 72/23 60/19 70/6 72/22 73/9 76/10 Ms. Solano's [1] 48/24 Nasdaq [1] 25/17 78/18 82/21 95/5 95/5 **much [7]** 6/8 15/24 19/18 **Nasdaq.com** [2] 25/17 **No. [4]** 31/20 33/14 34/15 73/15 86/12 86/16 86/16 25/21 51/2 mud [1] 45/15 **national** [1] 60/8 No. 22 [1] 34/15 multi [2] 26/13 76/13 nationwide [1] 13/4 No. 346 [1] 51/2 multi-disciplined [1] 26/13 nature [2] 18/2 76/2 No. 383 [1] 31/20 **multi-month** [1] 76/13 NEAL [2] 2/16 2/17 No. 388 [1] 33/14 multiple [4] 4/13 31/22 near [1] 75/7 **nobody [3]** 41/3 41/3 46/24 63/15 63/17 nearly [2] 52/4 84/24 Nods [1] 86/6 **multiples** [1] 17/16 necessarily [3] 4/12 78/12 **none** [5] 16/6 16/13 28/10 **multiplied** [1] 26/17 89/20 45/7 70/5 MURTHA [1] 3/12 necessary [2] 14/21 21/16 **norm** [1] 13/7 must [1] 5/24 need [37] 7/2 7/2 12/25 normal [4] 25/6 25/7 36/6 mutually [1] 38/10 13/13 13/18 13/21 14/12 90/21 my [78] 7/6 10/4 11/2 12/21 17/17 21/22 21/25 24/24 **normally [3]** 38/9 79/15 12/25 13/5 13/16 15/18 16/5 24/24 30/4 30/5 30/17 30/22 87/19 16/13 16/14 16/19 17/11 30/25 31/6 31/7 34/12 35/17 not [168] 17/20 17/21 18/14 18/19 44/23 45/25 51/21 53/11 **not -- I'm [2]** 17/23 23/21 19/10 24/18 27/19 28/14 74/9 76/9 78/21 81/25 82/21 **not** -- **in** [1] 7/8 29/5 29/13 30/6 33/6 33/13 84/3 84/18 85/8 89/11 89/16

N Case 4:22-cr-00612 **not -- you're** [1] 92/6 **note** [2] 21/11 96/10 **nothing [5]** 10/21 11/7 44/15 76/11 90/5 **notice [2]** 77/6 83/6 noticed [1] 21/12 **notion** [1] 26/8 novel [1] 17/4 now [44] 8/23 14/1 20/7 21/4 21/17 23/5 23/13 23/14 23/17 24/7 24/11 26/9 33/6 33/7 34/10 34/19 36/18 39/7 42/2 43/5 45/4 45/14 46/4 47/9 52/10 52/20 55/23 57/4 57/25 63/22 65/3 66/11 74/2 76/13 77/17 79/12 79/24 80/15 86/23 87/14 87/25 92/2 92/17 94/2 **number [8]** 12/16 15/8 39/3 42/20 69/21 69/23 82/4 82/11 **numbered** [1] 34/15 **numbers** [2] 34/16 61/16 **numerous** [1] 94/6 **NW [1]** 1/13

\mathbf{O}

O'Brien [3] 1/20 1/23 30/9 o'clock [1] 6/23 **o0o [1]** 96/18 **object** [2] 49/7 96/10 **objection** [7] 18/14 49/10 49/12 49/13 49/14 49/15 49/16 **obligation** [1] 56/14 observation [1] 84/7 **obtain [3]** 63/14 63/17 67/20 **obtained** [6] 21/2 21/19 43/24 43/25 50/7 50/12 **obviously [17]** 6/22 10/17 11/7 49/8 55/3 55/5 63/20 69/22 77/11 80/18 80/19

Docum 86/2036/27e8768 84/25/24 in \tag{3} 77\delta 40\frac{7}{6} 9\frac{7}{2} \frac{8}{9}/2 90/17 94/8 **occasioned** [1] 16/11 occasions [1] 20/10 **occurred** [1] 44/9 October [9] 4/21 5/15 5/17 13/6 16/18 18/7 28/12 29/7 78/9 **October 23 [1]** 29/7 October 23rd [2] 5/15 5/17 odd [3] 64/18 65/19 83/2 off [12] 4/16 7/15 7/21 8/6 10/7 15/9 17/12 36/14 60/18 73/6 74/25 77/5 offenses [1] 60/24 offer [3] 58/7 72/25 73/3 office [4] 1/16 16/5 60/4 81/3 official [2] 3/16 25/17 often [3] 31/15 31/23 64/14 **oftentimes** [1] 75/25 **oh [9]** 10/3 10/14 10/18 36/13 36/14 39/8 42/11 70/13 83/10 old [1] 92/25 omitted [1] 71/2 once [4] 44/10 80/7 80/8 85/23 one [92] 5/16 5/23 9/22 9/25 10/2 10/3 11/2 11/10 11/19 12/9 12/10 12/10 12/10 12/17 12/22 13/4 14/24 15/16 15/18 16/13 17/4 17/15 20/5 20/23 21/5 21/6 22/5 22/5 25/10 29/18 30/3 32/8 32/21 33/19 36/7 38/11 40/8 40/18 41/8 43/6 44/22 47/4 47/23 48/15 49/18 50/6 51/9 51/14 52/19 54/14 54/20 56/20 57/12 57/13 60/2 64/17 65/12 65/24 67/3 68/10 68/11 68/12 68/15 68/15 69/10 69/21 69/23 70/6 70/11 70/12 74/6 74/7

81/6 82/4 85/6 87/7 87/9 87/11 87/16 88/12 90/9 92/4 92/16 93/21 94/1 95/23 96/9 one -- one [1] 12/10 one -- that's [1] 22/5 one's [3] 39/8 39/8 54/22 ones [1] 43/10 **online** [1] 9/17 only [12] 10/14 10/15 13/15 22/18 23/13 32/17 32/21 55/9 65/14 65/23 82/25 84/15 ons [1] 46/7 open [4] 22/24 56/5 86/24 91/18 **opened** [1] 59/1 **opening** [1] 43/18 opinion [3] 8/5 18/22 59/4 **opinions** [1] 7/7 **opportunity** [1] 76/10 **oppose** [2] 33/16 33/23 opposed [2] 13/25 67/5 opposition [1] 33/9 option [1] 44/22 **orchestrate** [1] 81/17 order [15] 4/7 7/8 9/2 25/2 26/20 44/8 49/4 49/8 56/18 64/25 78/10 84/15 92/24 93/13 93/22 ordered [5] 41/24 56/15 64/7 64/9 64/24 ordering [9] 49/5 56/16 58/1 58/2 58/4 59/8 59/13 61/13 79/3 orders [8] 8/23 8/24 9/9 9/15 9/15 11/16 11/22 32/9 organized [1] 46/17 original [1] 21/15 other [42] 5/10 6/21 8/21 12/20 12/21 13/1 13/13 31/19 32/16 34/20 35/11 35/12 35/12 38/12 43/10 44/16 45/24 47/1 47/3 47/20

Case 4:22-cr-00612 other... [22] 48/21 49/2 53/21 55/19 61/2 61/5 61/19 62/6 62/23 65/12 68/16 68/22 69/2 73/4 76/3 76/12 76/16 79/18 81/19 86/17 87/17 96/9 others [6] 32/24 35/8 35/9 53/18 67/20 84/10 otherwise [5] 13/11 59/6 63/25 73/7 74/15 our [61] 5/6 7/11 8/10 11/11 11/14 16/1 19/14 20/7 20/14 22/20 24/8 24/11 24/15 25/10 27/10 28/3 28/3 28/8 28/10 28/14 30/2 30/3 30/20 31/2 31/3 31/6 31/19 37/9 37/10 37/19 40/9 43/19 47/8 47/21 48/3 53/16 54/24 55/9 56/13 61/22 61/24 62/15 63/12 68/19 76/15 76/16 76/22 81/3 82/16 83/23 85/10 85/12 85/25 89/24 90/3 90/8 90/10 90/11 90/15 90/23 90/24 our -- our [1] 28/3 ourselves [2] 19/13 62/23 out [54] 5/7 8/25 9/3 9/8 10/4 11/1 11/14 12/2 12/4 12/7 12/25 13/14 13/19 13/23 15/3 16/22 17/7 17/15 22/25 27/10 31/5 31/22 32/10 32/19 33/24 34/4 44/5 47/15 50/9 58/1 58/4 60/3 63/23 63/23 67/11 68/18 70/12 70/17 73/22 78/24 79/9 80/7 81/20 83/23 84/5 85/19 87/7 87/9 88/3 88/4 88/5 89/14 92/1 93/11 outside [4] 16/8 44/15 49/9 79/18 outstanding [3] 39/16 40/4 88/15 over [28] 4/22 5/23 14/25

Docum 24/6324/21626/9 62/16/24 in 42/15 42/16 42/17 42/17 43/25 44/24 46/6 47/5 48/3 48/4 48/14 55/9 57/10 64/15 73/9 80/13 80/13 81/15 81/21 86/3 93/7 paying [1] 34/21 peak [1] 11/4 penalize [1] 80/14 overnight [1] 34/4 overnight [1] 34/4 penalize [1] 80/14 penalize [1] 15/13 pending [7] 16/6 30/9 3 33/22 68/6 68/23 94/25 owes [2] 56/1 94/20 own [13] 15/19 17/11 27/10 32/24 37/11 37/11 37/14 38/14 50/6 56/22 59/7 60/10 62/25 per [1] 82/20 percent [3] 7/6 11/5 32/25/11 25/2 per [1] 82/20 percent [3] 7/6 11/5 32/25/11 25/2 per [1] 82/20 percent [3] 7/6 11/5 32/25/11 25/2 per [1] 82/20 percent [3] 7/6 11/5 32/25/11 25/24 in past [2] 25/4 125/2 past [2] 25/4 125/2 peak [3] 24/24 61/19 79/4 past [3] 24/24 61/19 79/

P

P.C [1] 2/10 **p.m [5]** 7/14 7/15 66/25 66/25 96/17 pace [1] 18/6 page [4] 13/22 53/24 54/7 58/4 page 2 [1] 54/7 pages [2] 46/6 48/4 paid [1] 34/20 pain [2] 89/1 91/24 panel [1] 79/19 paper [7] 14/23 18/11 45/21 52/16 65/15 65/20 66/1 papers [1] 10/14 paragraph [1] 34/17 parse [2] 87/2 87/6 part [14] 7/1 18/25 24/19 41/19 51/4 52/13 55/10 55/20 57/11 61/17 69/11 70/9 73/8 90/14 parte [1] 89/3 particular [4] 32/14 32/20 33/13 34/8 particularly [2] 8/15 91/5 parties [3] 25/5 59/2 81/8 partly [1] 56/24 partnership [2] 32/23 35/11 party [8] 23/1 23/1 70/7 70/7 89/24 90/4 91/3 91/4

34/10 34/14 past [3] 44/24 61/19 79/6 paying [1] 34/21 peak [1] 11/4 penalize [1] 80/14 penalty [1] 15/13 pending [7] 16/6 30/9 32/25 33/22 68/6 68/23 94/25 people [13] 4/23 9/7 9/8 35/11 41/12 57/10 69/14 75/14 78/20 79/17 84/2 84/5 89/13 per [1] 82/20 percent [3] 7/6 11/5 32/7 percentage [1] 26/9 peremptories [1] 81/8 perhaps [1] 24/25 **period** [7] 19/13 25/15 32/20 35/7 50/7 50/8 50/8 **period** -- **that** [1] 50/7 **permission** [1] 14/10 Perry [1] 28/22 person [8] 12/22 15/16 69/18 77/13 93/18 93/19 93/19 95/12 personal [1] 57/14 perspective [2] 16/12 75/10 pertains [1] 50/3 pertinent [1] 93/23 **Peter [1]** 64/10 **pettiness** [1] 82/8 phenomenon [2] 44/9 45/20 **PHILIP [2]** 1/12 2/9 **phone [4]** 17/11 17/13 33/21 43/19 phones [1] 59/7 **phonetic** [1] 64/21 pick [2] 8/15 69/23 picked [6] 24/8 48/6 70/11 70/12 77/18 80/8 piece [1] 15/20 pieces [2] 15/2 41/8 piling [1] 83/22

P Case 4:22-cr-00612 **PJ** [1] 47/20 place [4] 27/1 39/12 67/8 72/17 **PLAINTIFF** [1] 1/11 **plan [6]** 43/5 43/7 45/25 55/6 93/13 93/16 **platform** [1] 27/1 **platforms** [1] 8/22 **play [1]** 10/1 plea [1] 69/2 **pleading** [1] 16/4 **pleadings** [1] 56/22 **Please [1]** 9/18 **pledge** [1] 16/19 **plenty** [1] 10/23 **plow** [1] 78/14 **plowed** [1] 78/13 **plugged** [1] 53/9 plus [1] 20/12 pocket [2] 56/10 56/10 point [22] 10/13 11/1 11/14 12/2 14/7 14/24 17/7 22/9 25/20 30/7 31/2 37/15 45/12 50/1 61/20 63/5 67/11 72/1 72/12 72/21 73/11 74/8 point -- if [1] 30/7 **pointed** [2] 12/4 83/23 points [3] 13/14 26/4 26/22 **pool** [1] 44/7 **portion [2]** 7/21 49/6 portions [1] 12/7 position [16] 4/23 5/6 7/15 7/21 8/6 20/15 28/11 30/20 32/6 45/8 62/20 66/11 76/22 85/16 85/17 95/8 positions [2] 87/16 91/8 **positive** [1] 8/5 possession [15] 44/11 46/4 47/8 48/3 54/24 55/3 55/9 55/16 55/17 56/8 56/13 61/23 61/23 63/2 94/4 possibilities [1] 61/6 possible [4] 33/12 35/16

Docum 36/88375/Piled on 04/16/24 in presyentes 11246/1133 post [1] 83/25 posted [2] 25/16 25/25 posting [1] 25/23 postings [1] 32/13 posts [3] 26/25 27/1 36/8 pot [1] 39/6 potential [1] 51/16 potentially [7] 26/16 60/25 61/1 64/19 65/7 76/8 94/9 pour [1] 48/5 **pouring [1]** 15/10 practical [2] 74/4 74/12 practitioner [1] 34/19 preadmit [1] 93/6 **precedent** [1] 81/24 **precluded** [1] 45/25 predict [1] 8/24 prefer [1] 75/8 **preferred** [1] 69/5 prejudice [3] 38/8 38/9 38/15 prejudices [1] 28/3 prejudicial [1] 10/25 **preliminary** [1] 20/10 **preparation [2]** 14/8 15/5 prepare [2] 14/12 64/3 prepared [6] 5/13 9/14 19/1 36/5 58/25 96/7 **preparing** [1] 52/14 presence [1] 79/18 present [5] 19/2 49/4 79/1 80/16 81/7 presentation [5] 40/13 73/5 73/8 80/4 82/7 presented [3] 17/25 76/10 94/3 **presenting** [1] 43/12 presents [1] 82/11 press [3] 36/25 37/13 44/5 pressed [1] 45/16 **pressuring** [1] 47/17 pretrial [2] 14/8 81/18 pretty [2] 32/8 61/5

price [16] 8/2 8/6 8/25 11/20 32/5 32/10 40/19 40/23 41/12 41/12 41/22 44/14 44/21 57/7 76/10 76/11 prices [1] 8/10 primarily [6] 4/16 42/15 47/12 47/20 60/8 76/25 prior [1] 19/14 prioritizing [1] 76/17 privacy [1] 49/23 **privately [1]** 79/17 **probably [9]** 69/6 71/19 71/22 73/7 78/8 78/10 92/24 93/4 93/14 **problem [10]** 17/20 21/21 21/22 22/5 23/8 23/15 24/19 45/14 56/23 61/12 **problematic** [2] 21/5 64/3 procedures [1] 82/6 proceed [1] 5/12 proceedings [4] 3/24 4/1 96/17 96/20 process [7] 5/12 15/17 21/16 25/7 35/20 71/17 82/3 processing [2] 22/7 25/5 processor [2] 23/1 23/1 produce [12] 5/1 9/16 28/12 56/8 58/2 58/16 59/13 61/13 64/9 64/14 64/24 66/7 **produced** [15] 3/25 21/23 23/16 33/2 37/21 39/5 50/19 54/23 59/21 61/12 61/24 65/21 66/19 94/10 94/14 **produces** [1] 33/25 **producible** [1] 95/10 producing [8] 20/25 22/7 36/8 37/16 37/19 51/21 66/15 95/2 **production** [17] 20/18 20/23 20/25 21/5 21/24 25/8 25/13 26/10 26/23 27/8 27/9 27/19 34/15 36/12 43/20

P Case 4:22-cr-00612 **production...** [2] 61/17 95/18 **productions** [11] 20/17 20/19 22/10 22/25 23/2 23/14 24/21 25/1 26/18 34/18 64/11 **profit** [5] 31/23 32/4 35/2 44/22 73/12 **profitable** [1] 73/21 **profited** [1] 35/6 **profiting** [1] 35/2 profits [5] 8/7 9/4 40/24 50/7 50/11 program [1] 5/25 promise [1] 89/21 **promptly** [1] 33/12 promulgated [1] 16/1 **proof** [3] 43/5 43/6 85/10 **proper [3]** 18/13 27/20 28/15 puts -- rebuts [1] 35/10 **properly [1]** 16/17 **property [2]** 67/14 88/20 proportional [1] 82/11 **proposed** [1] 14/9 **proposing** [1] 63/12 prosecute [2] 9/21 75/11 prosecuted [1] 4/25 **prosecution** [5] 55/10 55/13 55/19 55/20 66/14 prosecutions [1] 17/4 prosecutor [2] 21/7 28/15 prosecutors [2] 47/16 52/19 prospective [1] 80/6 protect [1] 80/18 **protected** [1] 25/1 protective [2] 49/8 60/10 **protracted** [1] 35/17 **prove [3]** 71/25 75/22 83/21 proven [1] 32/16 provide [7] 5/3 29/6 32/1 34/12 62/23 63/7 63/19 **provided** [6] 34/8 34/9 34/24 52/5 52/7 90/25

Docum**en blis** [1] Free 5 on 04/16/24 in **Trusite** [8] a 30/323 9/155/1 **pulled** [1] 23/24 **pulling** [1] 17/12 pump [10] 9/22 10/2 10/3 11/7 12/11 12/13 18/1 40/15 64/21 75/24 pumped [1] 6/14 purchase [1] 18/23 purely [1] 71/6 **purported** [1] 29/15 purportedly [2] 12/11 27/24 push [2] 5/6 76/24 **put [30]** 5/25 9/9 10/16 13/15 15/6 16/4 16/12 16/14 16/22 17/17 17/21 20/3 22/8 23/12 24/11 30/19 30/19 41/9 44/4 52/1 52/15 53/5 54/24 60/10 63/16 69/18 70/9 71/5 87/7 92/16 puts [1] 35/10

0

qualified [1] 66/14 quantities [1] 8/2 **quarters** [1] 71/19 quasi [1] 64/8 quasi-government [1] 64/8 **QUENTIN** [1] 2/9 question [10] 7/16 58/10 71/6 71/7 71/22 71/22 77/10 80/13 82/22 95/11 questionable [1] 53/5 questioning [3] 79/13 82/7 83/18 questionnaire [4] 79/5 79/7 79/12 81/5 questions [7] 17/6 49/2 79/17 82/1 82/14 82/16 82/17 quibble [1] 85/25 quick [1] 14/25 quicker [1] 61/15 quickly [3] 9/10 61/5 75/9

77/23 79/3 79/24 80/13 92/15 quote [1] 21/10

R

rabbit [1] 61/4 raise [5] 12/21 13/9 13/20 65/24 94/2 raised [5] 10/10 13/20 51/7 64/24 94/2 ran [1] 33/24 **Ranch [1]** 1/20 random [1] 36/23 **randomly** [1] 5/8 rapid [1] 35/1 **rapid-fire** [1] 35/1 rarely [1] 53/25 rather [1] 96/11 **reached** [1] 8/7 reacting [1] 9/5 read [6] 8/4 46/5 57/13 59/9 59/12 95/11 **Reading [6]** 53/24 54/2 54/4 54/5 54/7 54/9 ready [17] 4/17 4/24 4/24 5/11 16/23 18/6 19/15 20/22 28/1 38/3 38/5 38/5 39/2 39/8 39/9 76/20 78/9 real [14] 12/3 12/6 17/11 17/12 25/8 25/13 25/19 25/20 25/20 26/4 29/6 54/12 77/9 82/1 real-time [1] 54/12 realistic [1] 85/4 realistically [4] 69/15 69/19 70/8 71/3 realize [2] 71/11 71/11 really [19] 8/18 12/15 15/21 17/21 23/9 29/4 30/25 33/9 44/17 60/21 76/3 78/25 80/4 82/19 84/5 87/25 88/12

93/12 93/17

really -- these [1] 12/15

reams [2] 14/23 18/11

Documerated [3] Fife 16 14 74/16/24 in tresprested [2] 234/9136/10 R Case 4:22-cr-00612 **requesting** [1] 43/19 81/25 reason [10] 19/17 27/13 requests [3] 4/14 32/25 94/6 **regarding** [1] 12/22 30/7 39/7 39/8 47/21 50/25 regret [1] 53/24 **required** [1] 47/7 51/8 51/17 87/10 **regular** [1] 78/5 requiring [1] 48/16 reasonable [2] 13/23 45/1 relate [2] 21/1 95/7 research [3] 22/12 26/20 reasons [4] 24/15 29/5 39/9 **related [6]** 26/11 39/20 26/21 40/15 40/10 57/1 59/4 90/3 reservation [1] 16/24 rebuts [1] 35/10 relates [2] 22/8 65/12 reserve [1] 10/16 receipt [1] 60/22 relationship [1] 88/2 reserving [1] 10/20 receive [1] 34/14 relationships [1] 75/14 resolved [2] 36/5 93/8 received [7] 20/23 24/21 resolves [1] 65/1 relative [4] 14/8 15/7 18/19 29/14 31/5 41/4 50/6 94/7 18/20 **resources** [1] 27/7 recently [2] 5/24 64/22 relayed [1] 19/16 respect [1] 83/17 Recess [1] 66/25 release [2] 37/13 44/5 respectfully [1] 91/7 reciprocal [1] 94/6 releases [1] 36/25 respectively [1] 13/22 recognizing [1] 55/22 relevant [7] 25/15 36/22 respond [13] 28/20 35/22 recollection [1] 37/17 74/22 85/19 90/8 94/5 94/9 35/25 67/7 67/7 67/10 67/11 **recommend** [1] 21/15 relied [1] 59/5 67/23 68/5 74/1 83/24 91/15 **recommended** [1] 33/20 relying [1] 23/16 91/22 **recommends** [1] 32/12 responds [1] 67/22 remedy [3] 5/6 27/21 28/16 record [5] 35/24 53/3 59/18 remember [1] 77/25 response [12] 33/8 34/8 96/10 96/20 54/2 62/10 72/22 87/22 90/8 remiss [1] 30/6 record -- the [1] 59/18 90/15 91/22 91/24 92/12 replied [1] 95/20 **recorded** [1] 3/24 reply [1] 74/9 94/7 records [35] 11/18 19/3 report [11] 34/25 35/5 responsible [1] 9/21 20/1 20/6 31/25 32/1 33/1 37/19 57/20 58/25 64/14 restitution [1] 83/25 36/8 43/24 43/24 47/2 47/8 result [2] 21/2 91/10 64/17 66/10 84/18 90/21 48/5 48/9 49/6 50/18 50/19 results [1] 21/13 96/1 50/20 54/17 54/18 54/23 retained [1] 34/20 reported [1] 21/13 55/7 59/14 59/18 61/9 61/10 **REPORTER [3]** 3/15 3/16 returned [1] 50/10 61/20 62/9 64/7 64/9 65/13 returns [1] 64/1 96/23 77/12 77/14 78/3 81/22 reports [9] 21/20 23/10 reveals [1] 48/13 records -- or [1] 49/6 30/19 41/4 41/5 56/3 56/4 review [3] 8/18 29/23 66/17 recounting [1] 89/8 66/9 95/16 **REYES [3]** 2/2 28/22 28/22 recreated [1] 19/24 represent [6] 16/17 19/11 **Rhonda [3]** 14/14 53/8 79/8 **Recreation** [1] 17/11 22/16 24/17 72/24 80/20 rid [4] 4/10 4/11 4/12 49/22 red [2] 11/16 17/13 representations [1] 52/3 **Ridge** [1] 79/21 redo [1] 20/13 represented [3] 15/24 48/18|right [64] 4/2 4/4 6/4 10/16 referenced [3] 16/3 54/21 94/3 12/12 13/1 13/11 17/10 20/7 56/3 representing [1] 46/21 28/4 29/25 31/14 34/11 **referred** [1] 25/15 36/17 39/13 43/3 48/6 48/9 represents [1] 48/4 **referring** [1] 21/15 request [3] 59/10 85/8 48/13 49/17 50/24 52/4 **reflecting** [1] 23/19 85/12 55/23 56/10 57/4 59/15 **refused** [1] 5/3

Document B&RCZ1846 1814/2/8/24/61 **saying (30)**e 4/147/6/683/10 R Case 4:22-cr-00612 7/18 7/18 12/10 12/12 18/15 5/21 49/13 67/5 74/1 82/15 **right...** [38] 59/23 59/25 20/25 31/21 37/7 38/13 82/18 64/5 65/1 66/3 66/22 67/1 **Rybarczyk's [2]** 33/10 38/20 40/12 44/6 56/12 67/2 67/8 67/18 68/4 68/14 45/12 56/24 56/24 57/2 62/16 66/6 68/18 70/23 73/25 74/2 66/12 70/11 79/11 87/17 S 74/24 77/7 79/24 80/9 80/24 87/17 91/6 91/13 95/13 82/6 83/7 84/11 85/9 86/5 **S-N-D-L** [1] $46/1\overline{3}$ 95/15 88/24 90/18 90/18 90/20 Sachs [1] 8/1 says [13] 17/10 21/10 23/18 92/17 92/19 92/23 93/22 said [45] 6/16 6/24 7/5 7/22 33/14 38/3 38/12 54/4 54/5 94/2 94/13 95/19 96/15 9/5 10/14 10/18 10/19 14/13 54/7 54/9 57/16 58/15 79/19 rights [5] 4/20 10/20 28/16 14/14 15/4 15/7 15/21 17/1 scenes [1] 74/18 35/19 38/21 17/17 18/11 18/17 24/2 schedule [2] 17/5 38/14 rises [1] 69/18 27/19 36/13 40/13 41/10 scheduling [4] 69/10 76/19 risk [1] 54/4 41/15 42/7 43/4 48/10 48/11 84/14 92/24 **RMR** [1] 3/15 48/11 50/13 51/23 51/23 scheme [1] 41/19 road [5] 1/20 13/12 13/17 61/9 64/1 72/21 75/23 77/6 **Schwab** [1] 8/1 49/24 89/16 77/7 77/17 77/17 84/1 85/8 **SCOTT [2]** 1/12 35/24 **rob** [2] 54/9 87/19 87/12 88/14 88/21 89/3 scoured [1] 46/6 **ROBERT [1]** 1/19 said -- Rhonda [1] 14/14 screen [2] 20/1 20/2 robust [2] 16/13 81/18 sale [2] 7/14 7/16 search [4] 21/2 43/25 66/8 **Roman [1]** 81/20 sales [1] 40/20 95/25 **roof [3]** 57/8 57/17 70/15 same [22] 5/10 6/9 13/22 seat [1] 39/24 **room** [7] 4/11 29/16 53/18 17/12 24/25 31/16 31/18 seated [2] 4/2 67/1 55/14 81/24 82/12 83/16 31/23 32/2 32/3 32/5 44/3 **SEC [40]** 30/13 30/18 30/21 room's [1] 81/6 44/5 47/14 47/15 54/9 58/3 42/1 42/2 42/3 42/7 43/14 **ROSEN [8]** 2/13 5/20 14/7 64/9 72/15 78/14 80/12 92/1 43/16 43/19 43/20 43/21 16/3 18/17 23/22 36/22 **Samesies** [1] 54/2 44/1 44/2 44/4 44/13 45/5 75/22 **SAMUEL** [1] 2/13 46/2 46/18 46/21 47/1 54/18 Rosen's [1] 15/2 **Saper** [1] 2/23 55/7 56/13 56/20 57/11 **Rosenthal** [1] 80/2 sat [1] 37/17 57/16 58/10 58/11 58/18 Ross [1] 3/13 saw [3] 16/1 37/3 46/25 58/25 59/2 61/9 64/7 64/9 round [1] 32/3 say [48] 6/23 7/4 7/6 7/17 64/14 64/22 76/25 84/16 row [3] 74/2 78/13 78/14 8/5 10/15 11/4 11/20 13/14 85/9 **Ruby** [1] 79/20 23/18 24/9 24/10 27/12 **SEC** -- **if** [1] 57/11 rule [6] 38/25 63/13 63/17 34/11 37/5 38/23 40/3 41/10 **SEC's [4]** 40/10 44/11 67/21 82/6 96/7 44/20 45/2 45/22 46/10 44/23 58/24 ruled [1] 67/3 48/22 53/6 53/6 55/12 56/9 second [7] 10/5 10/5 29/24 rules [3] 44/6 44/8 82/6 57/6 58/14 60/21 67/16 70/9 40/9 52/18 68/9 68/15 ruling [3] 65/6 85/25 96/14 72/9 72/10 72/12 74/6 75/16 **secondary** [1] 60/7 rulings [1] 84/2 76/10 76/20 77/14 77/15 seconds [2] 18/19 19/5 run [2] 21/18 61/5 77/18 78/4 78/16 79/6 82/25 securities [6] 18/2 18/4 running [2] 71/12 71/15 84/20 91/8 40/17 40/18 41/20 75/14 rush [1] 12/24 say -- and [1] 70/9 security [1] 60/8 **Rusk** [1] 3/16 say -- to [1] 8/5

Documente [2] bd 0/60 1/1/d/64 in + 144/1 1 45/d 6 60/23 74/16 S Case 4:22-cr-00612 serious [1] 5/9 74/17 74/17 74/20 see [32] 6/11 6/23 9/15 9/15 serves [1] 67/18 **showing** [1] 68/6 17/14 20/9 22/2 22/16 22/21 shown [1] 14/25 set [4] 68/9 85/11 91/12 23/6 23/7 31/7 42/25 43/10 sic [5] 10/23 13/16 15/22 92/24 49/7 50/20 57/18 65/25 setting [6] 4/11 4/12 39/14 30/10 89/14 68/22 70/1 70/2 70/11 70/16 side [2] 80/22 92/3 67/4 78/10 82/2 70/16 70/18 72/19 73/4 seven [8] 24/21 26/17 30/19 sides [1] 80/20 75/10 78/16 86/7 91/1 93/13 48/21 71/11 81/13 82/21 sideshow [1] 36/18 see -- I [1] 70/1 83/10 sign [2] 27/6 64/4 seeing [6] 8/16 8/21 74/3 **Signature** [1] 96/23 sever [5] 4/13 4/19 38/2 74/4 91/11 92/17 **signed [2]** 66/9 66/10 69/1 69/2 seek [3] 27/9 50/9 72/25 several [6] 20/10 20/17 **significance** [2] 18/8 76/17 seeking [2] 5/14 54/25 34/17 47/20 75/25 80/5 **significant [3]** 7/12 7/19 seems [1] 21/17 several-month-long [1] 38/15 seen [19] 6/2 6/5 9/23 9/23 75/25 similar [1] 14/23 13/5 13/5 15/24 29/11 47/14 simple [2] 17/25 19/3 severance [5] 5/14 33/11 57/23 74/19 83/14 83/16 37/25 38/13 38/16 simply [5] 7/6 7/10 11/2 86/11 86/13 89/21 90/5 **shared** [1] 31/25 13/19 17/2 90/12 90/12 shares [2] 11/20 25/18 simultaneously [1] 91/5 seizure [5] 52/2 52/2 52/6 **sharing** [1] 34/19 **SINA [3]** 3/5 3/6 94/12 52/10 66/8 since [6] 4/22 10/10 15/24 **she [13]** 11/13 35/5 38/6 **selected** [1] 33/15 46/23 69/12 78/23 41/23 46/17 52/13 52/14 selective [1] 37/17 single [3] 20/5 29/18 36/7 52/15 71/17 81/14 88/3 88/6 selfish [1] 83/4 89/15 sister [3] 60/15 87/18 87/21 sell [14] 7/15 7/21 8/2 8/6 sit [3] 10/1 39/6 78/19 she's [2] 38/3 38/20 8/23 8/24 9/2 9/9 9/9 9/15 sitting [6] 11/23 31/13 36/1 **Shepherd** [1] 3/3 11/16 11/20 32/4 88/20 shift [1] 39/13 55/13 57/20 94/8 selling [5] 7/6 11/6 12/13 **shirt** [1] 72/7 **situation [2]** 24/4 51/19 44/8 72/14 **shit** [1] 54/3 six [6] 7/11 27/23 69/5 69/5 sells [2] 11/19 23/23 **shocked [3]** 16/5 40/12 81/13 83/7 **Senate [2]** 41/24 81/20 Sixth [3] 13/1 28/16 29/4 40/14 send [2] 22/25 34/1 **shoehorn** [1] 61/6 skin [1] 73/23 sense [2] 18/16 38/19 **short** [4] 44/8 70/20 80/21 slid [1] 83/7 sent [4] 47/7 64/14 66/13 82/13 slowed [1] 15/17 95/13 **shot** [1] 38/12 **small [7]** 8/2 10/7 31/23 separate [1] 87/25 shots [1] 39/7 31/23 32/4 35/3 35/7 separately [2] 65/10 92/13 **should [15]** 17/6 28/2 39/12 **smearing** [1] 41/1 **SEPTEMBER [7]** 1/9 6/24 so -- these [1] 47/21 45/9 45/11 45/13 45/21 21/8 77/19 77/19 77/20 so-called [1] 41/7 45/24 46/1 66/19 77/23 79/2 96/22 81/10 81/18 87/23 social [1] 36/8 **September 23rd [1]** 6/24 **SOLANO [5]** 1/22 19/11 shouldn't [1] 23/16 **September 3rd [1]** 77/19 **show [15]** 10/4 11/12 12/1 40/7 47/5 86/9 **September 4th [1]** 77/20 15/22 18/8 32/14 33/4 38/8 **Solano's** [1] 48/24 **September 5th [1]** 77/19

Docume 0/8640/8 1926 d 31874416/24 in +3311 3764 37616 37320 S Case 4:22-cr-00612 **speaking [1]** 41/5 40/19 61/25 61/25 65/15 sold [6] 6/14 18/24 32/2 special [1] 51/22 65/20 66/5 66/19 72/18 95/1 32/5 48/12 53/24 **specific [4]** 18/3 19/13 25/9 95/3 **solo [1]** 34/19 **STATES [12]** 1/1 1/4 1/9 40/18 **solution** [1] 28/5 **specifically [2]** 25/14 75/14 1/13 1/16 46/22 55/15 55/16 some [47] 6/5 7/15 9/4 9/14 speculation [1] 57/25 55/25 56/7 57/10 71/7 9/14 10/25 12/11 15/6 18/3 speed [4] 15/11 15/17 85/12 station [1] 60/4 20/6 21/12 21/12 22/19 93/9 statistics [1] 16/1 22/24 23/2 23/10 23/15 25/3 **speedily** [1] 79/8 status [1] 60/10 25/12 29/11 35/10 36/21 **speedy [6]** 4/20 27/25 28/3 steal [1] 87/20 37/2 47/12 49/1 54/14 57/25 **Stefan** [1] 31/13 38/18 38/20 38/22 63/5 64/11 67/4 69/8 69/14 stenography [1] 3/24 spell [1] 46/12 73/1 74/9 77/9 81/2 81/3 step [1] 20/11 spend [1] 17/20 81/8 81/20 84/16 86/11 **spending** [1] 88/5 **STEPHANIE** [1] 2/10 86/19 86/21 87/25 88/6 92/6 **spliced** [1] 12/6 **STEPHEN** [1] 1/19 93/2 spreadsheets [3] 34/23 steps [2] 36/6 60/17 somebody [8] 70/17 78/4 **Stewart** [1] 67/18 48/19 65/16 78/5 78/13 79/19 88/1 93/16 spring [4] 93/1 93/2 93/4 stick [1] 57/9 93/17 still [4] 28/6 53/10 68/6 93/4 somebody's [1] 78/13 **squarely [3]** 13/7 51/9 81/15 somehow [4] 31/3 31/3 stock [37] 6/14 7/7 7/10 73/19 60/22 81/17 stab [1] 81/19 7/14 8/2 8/6 8/10 8/12 11/3 **Someone** [1] 9/2 11/4 11/5 11/5 18/22 25/14 **staffing** [1] 93/16 something [13] 6/25 28/3 31/22 32/2 32/4 32/5 32/13 stance [1] 76/5 29/11 34/1 34/1 46/21 64/2 stand [7] 45/2 52/8 74/6 32/15 35/1 40/20 41/10 44/8 67/14 67/20 77/23 89/3 78/16 85/7 90/10 90/10 45/19 46/9 46/16 48/11 90/21 92/8 **standing** [1] 10/9 48/14 53/21 58/25 59/4 **sometime** [1] 84/2 standpoint [6] 24/20 70/21 64/17 70/14 70/14 72/6 sometimes [8] 11/20 24/1 72/16 70/22 74/4 74/4 74/12 25/4 32/3 37/16 64/15 69/16 staring [1] 9/7 stocks [35] 7/18 8/15 30/15 78/15 start [9] 4/15 4/18 31/20 32/19 36/24 40/10 40/23 somewhat [1] 57/24 40/12 53/3 69/19 71/4 79/12 41/20 41/21 42/6 42/16 soon [2] 34/9 88/4 42/18 43/7 43/9 43/9 44/13 93/7 sorry [7] 36/10 58/21 65/5 started [1] 81/15 45/6 45/9 45/18 46/2 46/3 75/6 87/4 90/3 91/16 starts [2] 33/6 53/23 46/18 46/25 54/20 57/1 58/6 sort [5] 5/23 82/8 87/16 state [2] 32/14 34/17 58/7 64/18 82/11 82/13 88/16 89/11 stated [1] 30/13 82/14 82/15 82/19 83/20 **Sotto [1]** 14/3 statement [11] 15/2 18/22 84/8 sounds [1] 89/12 stood [3] 42/7 46/19 48/10 19/4 66/14 87/11 95/4 95/10 source [2] 48/2 53/6 95/12 96/2 96/4 96/5 stop [1] 6/2 sources [1] 26/5 **statements [25]** 5/4 14/19 **stopped** [3] 5/23 35/12 **South [2]** 1/20 3/3 15/7 15/18 17/15 24/6 27/24 35/13 **SOUTHERN** [1] 1/1 28/8 29/23 29/24 36/23 stories [1] 72/11 speak [7] 14/21 32/22 33/19

Documenticiently let lo 82/4/16/24 in r\$\$H5 66H20 66H2A 69H12 S Case 4:22-cr-00612 suggest [2] 41/9 62/8 71/5 71/10 76/4 77/1 77/13 story [1] 41/7 78/25 79/1 84/25 84/25 85/5 suggested [1] 4/7 **STRADLEY [2]** 2/5 2/6 suggestion [4] 4/5 60/16 86/19 91/21 91/21 94/25 straight [2] 48/2 48/2 81/2 85/6 taken [7] 15/3 26/25 36/6 straightforward [2] 92/8 66/6 66/25 83/11 95/8 suggestions [1] 84/7 92/11 **suggests** [1] 51/3 takes [3] 26/16 27/10 29/19 strains [1] 60/21 taking [5] 17/14 31/23 **Suite** [10] 1/16 1/20 2/3 2/6 strange [1] 87/19 2/17 2/24 3/6 3/10 3/13 3/16 35/12 36/21 76/22 strategy [3] 23/5 54/12 summaries [6] 23/13 37/7 talk [15] 18/14 30/10 39/13 87/14 37/10 37/10 47/6 48/16 39/23 39/24 44/17 45/23 streamline [2] 82/2 84/6 summary [13] 20/3 20/4 64/19 69/12 71/17 74/25 **Street [5]** 1/16 2/14 3/6 3/10 20/5 22/14 22/14 22/18 77/22 86/15 86/24 94/13 57/14 23/20 23/22 75/12 75/17 talked [5] 29/13 29/22 43/9 strengthen [2] 30/2 30/3 77/10 77/10 81/21 81/4 93/23 stretch [2] 53/10 66/23 sun [1] 69/18 talking [16] 18/17 18/18 strictly [1] 24/20 **Sundial [3]** 42/6 42/16 20/12 29/23 40/11 40/22 strikes [1] 37/21 46/13 41/1 43/7 46/19 61/19 69/15 strongly [1] 62/8 superseding [2] 25/16 71/6 76/13 86/25 90/23 **struggling** [1] 87/25 92/15 68/18 studied [1] 35/5 supervision [1] 64/8 talks [1] 87/10 study [1] 95/23 **support** [1] 15/19 tally [1] 29/8 **stuff [5]** 6/21 36/17 44/16 **supporting** [1] 88/17 target [1] 8/7 78/6 86/17 task [5] 9/20 17/22 23/19 **supposed [4]** 22/16 27/24 **sub** [1] 73/1 27/25 43/23 27/11 27/13 **subject** [1] 67/15 **TATE [1]** 2/9 suppression [1] 22/8 **submitted** [2] 42/2 43/14 tax [7] 47/6 47/8 48/9 49/5 **Supreme [4]** 38/7 38/24 subpoena [4] 47/15 63/20 67/13 67/16 49/5 64/1 83/3 64/3 65/22 sure [16] 7/3 13/10 16/23 tax -- your [1] 49/5 **subpoenaed** [1] 59/1 **TD [8]** 47/13 47/16 47/17 18/13 22/1 23/18 29/18 **subpoenas** [1] 63/17 47/19 77/24 77/24 78/1 78/2 54/19 62/14 65/21 72/10 subscriber [1] 27/5 80/1 85/14 85/16 89/24 **TD -- what [1]** 77/24 subscribers [1] 27/6 tea [1] 57/7 92/18 subsequent [1] 51/2 **surrounding** [1] 51/10 team [15] 19/15 20/7 22/20 subsequently [1] 44/7 sweet [2] 70/20 80/21 24/15 25/6 25/10 50/5 51/5 substance [2] 90/24 95/7 synthesized [2] 23/10 24/5 55/10 55/13 55/13 55/19 substantive [4] 15/20 18/20 55/20 76/16 82/16 19/20 72/1 teams [1] 76/16 such [4] 17/22 36/7 36/8 tackle [1] 10/3 technical [1] 41/2 63/8 tagged [1] 94/11 technicalities [1] 29/3 suffer [2] 5/7 27/22 tailor [1] 84/3 technology [1] 34/21 **suffered [2]** 16/10 41/3 taint [1] 79/19 tee [2] 13/9 36/7 **suffering** [1] 88/16 take [30] 7/23 25/4 26/14 tell [14] 7/2 15/9 16/23 18/4 suffices [1] 62/11 26/19 29/15 34/12 37/25 40/1 57/4 61/16 62/20 66/22 sufficient [1] 22/1 39/6 48/21 52/22 65/9 66/12

T Case 4:22-cr-00612 91/23 93/14 tell... [5] 72/8 74/21 79/24 that -- their [1] 30/18 83/10 95/3 that -- those [1] 92/12 telling [10] 6/15 16/16 that -- what [1] 29/13 45/18 55/23 61/11 72/15 that's [81] 7/18 8/9 8/9 9/13 74/2 89/19 90/2 91/3 10/7 10/17 10/23 11/5 14/20 tells [2] 32/12 41/6 17/2 18/25 21/21 22/5 22/5 ten [10] 9/24 13/6 32/7 23/19 25/20 26/1 26/3 27/24 36/14 43/1 67/23 68/4 81/11 28/4 28/15 32/8 33/15 33/17 91/21 91/22 37/5 38/12 40/6 40/21 41/11 tend [3] 75/4 75/8 76/7 41/14 41/17 44/22 45/20 tens [2] 48/17 48/18 47/11 48/23 51/8 52/23 terabyte [1] 5/23 53/16 54/14 54/21 55/8 56/6 term [3] 7/25 40/15 40/21 57/4 57/11 59/12 59/15 61/4 terms [1] 29/14 61/12 63/12 63/24 64/17 testified [2] 42/2 42/3 66/11 67/20 68/14 69/22 **testify [3]** 28/14 72/5 77/1 74/2 74/20 76/22 77/1 77/11 **testifying [10]** 21/1 21/7 77/20 79/10 79/11 80/20 21/9 28/13 52/8 60/20 65/7 80/20 81/23 81/23 82/9 66/7 66/13 95/14 82/12 82/12 82/19 84/22 testimony [7] 46/5 46/7 86/5 87/12 88/23 89/10 77/14 86/21 86/22 88/11 91/23 92/17 94/8 96/3 96/5 95/8 that's -- that's [2] 81/23 TEXAS [15] 1/1 1/17 1/21 82/12 2/4 2/7 2/11 2/18 2/21 2/24 their [61] 6/12 8/1 8/17 9/7 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/13 3/17 60/4 10/14 14/17 14/18 17/18 text [16] 12/5 12/6 17/12 18/8 19/16 19/17 20/2 20/2 28/4 28/13 28/17 30/11 21/15 22/2 53/17 73/6 74/15 30/18 31/2 34/2 34/16 35/5 88/7 88/9 89/12 37/10 37/11 41/14 42/20 texts [1] 17/21 than [12] 6/8 9/23 29/13 51/3 52/8 52/11 52/12 54/25 32/5 41/2 41/19 43/10 43/12 55/3 55/4 56/21 61/2 61/23 46/20 79/11 84/21 96/11 62/7 70/14 73/20 75/11 thank [15] 14/14 19/7 27/15 76/24 78/3 80/7 80/8 80/8 28/21 35/23 49/25 65/11 80/10 81/8 81/9 82/23 83/18 78/19 92/19 92/20 92/21 84/3 84/3 88/9 91/23 95/7 94/19 94/22 96/8 96/16 95/12 thanks [2] 54/8 82/25 their -- is [1] 95/12 Thanksgiving [1] 16/22 them [72] 4/8 9/14 9/17 that [621] 10/16 12/19 13/9 16/6 19/24 that -- and [4] 6/21 68/10 21/5 23/4 23/4 27/7 28/17 75/20 89/11 30/22 30/22 33/3 33/3 33/21 that -- that [8] 25/15 29/21

Docum 37/16377/23e8662202/16924 in +33621 37624 37824 4098 40/24 41/9 45/13 45/19 46/10 47/17 48/21 49/6 49/7 49/20 52/9 55/3 55/5 55/6 56/4 58/13 61/14 61/16 62/5 62/16 62/17 62/19 62/23 62/23 63/2 63/7 63/7 63/9 63/11 63/11 63/13 63/16 63/17 63/22 65/22 69/10 70/13 74/17 75/15 78/4 79/7 79/8 79/17 83/17 83/18 87/20 93/11 93/11 94/21 95/4 themselves [3] 14/21 50/20 73/22 then [48] 6/14 6/24 10/15 11/6 18/24 19/4 20/3 20/8 21/22 22/19 23/7 25/4 29/24 29/25 32/4 34/24 35/18 40/20 40/25 42/2 43/6 45/14 47/4 47/18 48/12 48/14 52/7 55/19 56/17 56/19 59/24 64/19 68/11 68/18 71/21 71/23 71/25 73/3 79/16 79/21 81/14 82/13 84/5 87/22 88/7 89/14 91/14 91/25 18/13 21/1 21/6 24/22 26/11 then-acting [1] 42/2 theories [2] 17/4 39/11 there -- I [2] 37/22 59/17 there -- if [1] 49/4 43/4 43/22 43/23 44/3 46/11 | there'll [1] 11/20 there's [43] 11/2 11/17 11/18 11/22 12/2 12/2 12/9 12/20 13/18 21/4 21/20 21/25 22/2 22/6 22/16 23/15 26/9 29/11 31/4 37/12 37/17 47/3 47/3 50/21 51/18 55/18 58/15 58/16 65/12 65/17 68/10 68/11 72/22 73/9 75/24 82/21 82/25 86/13 86/15 86/21 87/9 87/12 93/17 there's -- and [1] 86/15

T Case 4:22-cr-00612 therefore [8] 5/14 35/20 39/2 44/22 60/18 66/17 72/18 95/10 these [107] these -- these [1] 42/5 they [160] they -- if [1] 61/13 they -- the [1] 23/25 they -- they [2] 23/19 70/13 they -- what [1] 43/4 they'll [4] 10/2 45/16 72/10 83/24 they're [50] 4/16 4/17 5/2 5/2 8/16 10/6 10/19 10/20 11/2 11/23 11/23 12/7 17/19 18/10 20/25 25/6 37/7 38/23 39/10 39/25 41/14 42/22 48/1 55/4 57/6 57/15 57/18 62/7 63/2 65/17 65/17 71/14 73/16 73/17 75/13 75/15 75/16 76/5 76/7 76/9 76/24 80/7 80/9 80/9 80/11 80/12 82/17 87/16 87/17 94/8 they've [12] 10/21 11/19 11/21 12/5 13/14 19/25 20/3 23/23 27/19 43/4 43/22 50/8 thing [15] 8/21 11/3 12/10 13/13 74/21 76/4 77/4 79/2 80/9 82/8 88/14 89/11 92/1 92/16 96/9 things [25] 4/4 4/7 20/22 21/4 22/11 27/8 29/1 29/12 30/4 33/12 39/5 42/8 48/9 53/5 61/15 64/13 81/3 81/4 81/4 84/24 87/7 88/8 90/18 92/3 93/9 think [105] think -- I [1] 76/23 thinking [4] 61/5 74/2 75/1 79/23 thinks [1] 91/9 third [13] 23/1 23/1 25/4 48/24 49/1 49/17 59/2 59/24

Docum 86/3686/23 ip 90/4 90/4318123 in + 73/15 87/3687/26 88/389/10 third-party [2] 23/1 23/1 this [237] this -- because [1] 52/1 this -- the [1] 6/11 this -- this [1] 9/10 This -- what [1] 58/23 this -- your [1] 58/15 **THOMAS [2]** 1/15 67/17 thoroughly [1] 83/13 those [48] 8/24 10/19 18/8 18/9 23/2 23/16 24/11 24/14 24/15 24/18 29/18 29/25 32/20 39/17 42/9 42/19 43/5 43/9 45/24 48/23 52/10 52/21 59/12 61/12 61/17 62/11 62/22 64/9 65/1 65/21 66/18 67/21 67/23 72/3 73/8 73/11 74/1 74/15 84/2 84/7 86/11 89/25 90/4 91/8 92/12 93/8 95/2 95/18 though [8] 5/5 31/20 42/10 42/23 43/5 50/12 55/12 85/20 thought [8] 4/8 24/12 24/12 72/6 72/23 73/4 78/8 84/21 thought -- where [1] 24/12 thousand [4] 11/20 20/12 45/17 51/18 thousands [3] 25/2 40/25 46/6 three [13] 29/14 35/7 40/4 46/22 49/20 54/16 71/19 74/14 75/24 76/1 79/9 80/15 93/11 three -- the [1] 74/14 three-quarters [1] 71/19 three-year [1] 35/7 through [30] 9/14 11/10 11/25 12/16 15/10 15/17 17/8 21/16 23/14 29/17 30/5 45/15 46/6 52/12 57/8 57/17 66/24 69/25 70/15 71/12 71/15 73/1 74/7 74/14 75/13

throughout [2] 43/21 44/9 throws [1] 9/2 **thumb [3]** 34/6 34/8 34/10 **Thursday** [1] 79/7 ticker [1] 25/14 tickers [3] 46/9 59/4 83/1 tied [3] 77/22 83/19 84/8 ties [1] 39/25 till [2] 27/23 39/22 time [63] 5/10 6/9 7/13 7/13 10/6 12/14 13/20 13/21 14/12 16/22 17/12 19/13 20/18 22/1 22/10 24/24 24/24 25/22 25/24 26/14 26/15 26/17 27/10 27/21 29/20 30/1 30/5 31/16 31/18 32/17 32/20 33/24 34/25 35/7 35/15 35/21 39/2 50/7 50/8 50/8 50/12 54/12 54/13 67/6 67/10 72/15 75/1 77/2 78/6 79/13 79/14 80/10 81/25 82/8 83/12 83/18 83/24 84/9 87/25 88/5 88/18 91/17 93/10 time-wise [1] 75/1 times [5] 26/17 31/22 32/3 32/7 93/12 timestamp [1] 23/15 timestamps [8] 12/22 21/12 21/14 21/21 21/23 21/25 29/21 34/23 timing [3] 22/3 22/4 78/10 title [1] 25/17 titling [1] 33/8 today [11] 4/5 17/5 25/18 40/11 44/19 46/1 53/18 56/25 57/20 92/4 94/25 together [16] 4/8 5/25 15/20 16/14 17/18 17/21 20/3 28/18 30/19 30/19 38/23 38/25 39/1 48/22 79/4 88/5 told [2] 17/22 39/7 tolled [1] 39/2

Documer 4654/1 Flite @ di4648165/13n. T Case 4:22-cr-00612 tons [1] 37/22 too [1] 22/23 took [4] 26/25 27/1 60/17 81/12 **tool [2]** 21/18 21/20 top [2] 53/24 73/6 **Torchlight** [1] 25/18 totally [1] 74/11 town [2] 88/3 89/15 track [1] 77/5 trade [8] 8/8 43/24 48/4 48/22 65/13 65/16 65/21 73/21 **trade -- the [1]** 65/16 traded [5] 25/25 34/25 43/9 43/11 53/21 trader [4] 8/23 31/21 32/18 63/6 traders [2] 8/1 8/15 trades [14] 6/22 8/3 22/3 23/22 26/15 26/15 28/9 31/22 31/24 33/4 37/11 48/18 65/16 71/2 **TradeZero** [1] 47/19 trading [35] 5/24 6/20 8/4 8/22 10/4 11/18 19/3 20/1 25/15 26/18 29/25 32/19 32/24 32/25 35/2 36/8 44/7 48/2 50/6 50/11 53/20 54/12 54/17 54/23 59/14 59/18 59/18 61/10 61/20 61/25 61/25 62/1 62/9 65/23 77/25 **traditional** [1] 64/21 transcript [2] 3/24 96/19 transfer [4] 50/15 51/5 61/6 87/8 transpired [1] 88/7 travels [1] 64/15 **TRCH [3]** 25/14 25/23 25/25 trial [70] 4/11 4/12 4/20 4/21 4/24 4/25 5/9 5/10 5/13 5/15 5/17 10/1 10/24 12/24

16/7 18/2 18/5 18/9 18/13 18/19 19/14 19/15 20/22 27/25 28/4 28/12 30/23 30/25 35/18 35/18 36/4 36/10 36/11 36/16 36/19 36/20 38/3 38/18 38/21 38/22 39/1 39/14 39/22 39/25 41/2 41/16 45/16 67/4 69/5 69/22 73/3 73/5 73/8 75/25 77/22 78/10 81/15 82/5 82/10 82/13 82/21 83/3 85/11 87/14 93/7 trial's [3] 9/11 69/11 78/7 trials [1] 80/6 tried [7] 36/15 38/23 38/25 70/19 72/23 81/10 83/15 trier [1] 19/6 trips [1] 32/3 trouble [1] 17/3 true [1] 60/17 trusted [1] 72/13 truthfully [3] 34/25 44/16 48/20 try [16] 9/3 14/11 41/14 41/16 58/4 64/3 69/7 70/5 75/2 75/13 85/22 85/23 92/25 93/1 93/3 94/21 trying [20] 8/8 8/24 10/7 10/10 15/11 17/23 33/11 33/17 35/2 39/10 57/3 68/22 70/3 74/7 75/21 80/19 85/4 87/23 89/23 95/4 turn [3] 47/5 63/23 63/23 turned [1] 6/25 tweet [5] 7/13 7/14 8/25 11/6 18/15 tweeting [1] 8/19 tweets [7] 14/19 21/10 21/13 21/14 22/4 23/24 33/17 Twenty [2] 13/2 13/3 Twenty-four [2] 13/2 13/3 twice [2] 54/10 85/22

Tewitter-15113/22123/16 21/19 22/2 25/24 25/25 26/2 26/8 26/11 26/15 32/13 43/24 72/6 72/8 72/13 two [36] 6/25 9/22 11/19 16/7 17/15 20/20 21/4 36/11 38/11 39/14 40/14 44/23 44/24 47/3 47/24 48/16 50/3 60/6 64/1 67/24 69/7 69/7 71/2 71/3 71/9 71/21 75/20 75/24 76/1 79/9 87/7 87/7 87/15 89/13 92/12 93/3 two -- I [1] 69/7 type [2] 12/12 40/18 typical [1] 19/25 typically [2] 7/5 9/22

IJ

U.S [3] 16/1 62/17 62/19 UK [1] 12/22 ultimate [1] 73/12 ultimately [1] 23/9 Um [1] 52/25 uncharged [2] 72/20 74/8 **under [11]** 5/7 24/14 27/22 27/25 37/12 47/2 51/13 60/18 64/8 82/6 95/10 **underbrush** [1] 54/15 underground [1] 57/9 underlying [11] 19/20 20/1 20/13 22/2 22/15 22/15 23/12 27/4 30/15 31/1 58/24 **underscore** [1] 74/12 understand [16] 6/19 7/1 20/21 29/18 56/2 56/6 59/17 61/11 69/16 70/1 76/16 76/17 85/24 89/3 96/13 96/14 understandably [1] 5/11 understanding [1] 89/24 understatement [1] 27/12 **Understood** [2] 37/9 85/21 unfair [1] 78/12

unflattering [1] 89/4

unheard [1] 36/12

U Case 4:22-cr-00612 unique [2] 36/1 36/3 **UNITED [12]** 1/1 1/4 1/9 1/13 1/16 46/22 55/15 55/16 55/25 56/7 57/10 71/7 **United States [7]** 46/22 55/15 55/16 55/25 56/7 57/10 71/7 universe [3] 72/22 73/2 73/9 unless [2] 10/22 56/15 **unopposed** [1] 33/21 **unpack** [5] 4/2 53/2 75/19 75/21 77/3 **unprepared** [1] 80/12 until [6] 5/4 20/20 39/2 51/6 60/13 68/24 untoward [1] 37/21 **up [50]** 6/14 9/2 9/9 11/5 13/9 15/11 15/16 19/17 20/9 20/20 20/22 21/11 22/21 23/6 24/8 34/5 36/7 40/20 40/21 41/12 42/7 44/17 44/21 45/2 45/16 45/17 46/24 47/18 48/10 48/22 52/8 52/22 54/21 55/12 65/9 66/20 72/1 73/6 74/6 77/13 78/16 79/19 79/20 80/22 81/6 86/7 93/9 93/10 94/25 95/23 **upon [2]** 14/7 19/1 **upset** [1] 88/6 **us [18]** 8/18 10/17 19/1 22/11 22/11 22/20 26/19 27/4 32/1 34/1 43/16 51/21 58/4 58/9 63/5 65/13 90/25 94/10 use [6] 16/21 16/21 26/5 32/9 43/5 80/2 used [10] 9/21 17/13 40/17 47/12 47/13 47/20 61/1 63/7 63/15 70/4 using [1] 57/12 **usually [5]** 11/18 65/22

Docum 80/6383/4i83/68 04/16/24 in TX\$/11 55/61 53/667/21 UUU [1] 64/17 waited [1] 27/23

V

vacation [1] 83/4 value [1] 67/20 variables [1] 76/12 variance [1] 35/9 various [1] 67/5 various -- Mr. Rybarczyk [1] 67/5 version [2] 66/10 66/10 versus [1] 55/15 very [32] 5/24 10/7 10/7 13/8 14/7 16/13 17/24 19/6 21/4 25/9 27/10 29/6 29/11 29/11 30/11 31/2 31/23 35/9 39/5 39/5 39/10 41/23 43/11 47/4 48/25 55/21 76/3 82/1 86/22 88/6 89/15 94/1 victim's [1] 72/9 victims [3] 43/23 71/25 72/3 video [1] 44/5 view [3] 7/11 23/3 87/11 **viewable [1]** 60/11 violate [1] 28/16 violated [1] 38/21 violating [1] 34/2 violation [3] 5/12 35/11 41/2 visit [1] 86/2 voce [1] 14/3 voir [3] 79/4 79/15 84/4 volatility [2] 8/12 8/15 **volume** [10] 8/13 12/16 15/23 15/25 16/15 24/23 24/25 29/25 30/15 41/22 voluminous [1] 20/7 vote [3] 5/16 29/8 76/15 **VS [1]** 1/5

W

W-E-B-U-L-L [1] 47/11 Waco [1] 79/21 wait [7] 23/6 28/17 55/11 waited [1] 27/23 walk [3] 17/8 21/16 76/19 Walker [2] 3/9 3/12 wall [2] 57/14 60/18 **Wall Street [1]** 57/14 want [46] 4/4 17/18 21/11 21/11 28/19 29/1 29/15 31/17 31/20 36/13 38/5 38/13 40/1 61/8 69/8 69/12 69/22 77/9 77/12 77/14 77/21 78/6 78/13 78/25 79/4 79/22 79/22 80/4 80/14 80/18 81/1 85/17 85/18 85/22 86/2 86/15 88/16 91/14 91/14 93/6 93/7 93/8 93/15 93/21 94/13 94/14 wanted [6] 9/12 17/7 23/6 49/22 49/23 65/24 wants [7] 4/16 4/21 35/22 37/23 53/1 74/25 88/17 warnings [2] 27/4 27/8 warnings -- all [1] 27/8 warrant [7] 38/15 52/2 52/2 52/6 66/8 66/8 95/25 warrants [3] 21/2 43/25 52/11 **Washington** [1] 1/14 wasn't [7] 7/4 12/13 12/13 52/6 52/6 88/11 89/22 waste [7] 33/7 33/11 33/23 80/10 81/25 82/8 83/12 wastes [1] 83/18 wasting [1] 93/10 watch [1] 32/9 Waters [1] 41/23 Waters's [1] 46/17 wave [1] 45/21 waves [1] 45/19 wax [1] 17/23 way [26] 4/9 4/25 16/17 17/18 18/5 20/23 23/25 30/3 34/1 36/13 36/14 39/8 43/11 43/16 63/21 63/24 64/3 70/4

WCase 4:22-cr-00612 way... [8] 70/13 70/19 73/23 75/1 75/10 79/18 85/12 95/11 we [309] We -- and [1] 24/22 we -- I've [1] 25/5 we -- it [1] 19/1 we -- you [1] 24/5 we'd [4] 64/7 73/3 73/3 73/7 we'll [11] 10/18 13/22 39/22 63/21 71/4 75/3 79/5 79/17 85/25 92/18 96/10 we'll -- that [1] 63/21 we're [**58**] 4/23 5/14 7/5 7/5 7/18 7/18 8/21 9/20 9/20 10/1 10/14 10/21 11/1 11/14 11/25 12/1 12/18 13/11 13/13 14/1 18/18 20/11 23/21 29/17 29/23 30/1 36/17 39/7 40/11 45/15 49/23 55/4 58/23 61/19 63/1 64/7 66/12 69/10 69/12 69/23 69/24 70/2 71/6 72/23 73/9 74/7 74/12 75/25 76/13 76/18 76/20 78/25 79/19 79/23 79/25 88/21 95/13 95/14 we've [20] 9/14 15/7 24/21 29/11 35/16 40/6 44/19 50/4 62/21 64/11 65/13 65/23 66/17 68/22 75/2 79/6 81/4 87/6 87/10 87/22 we've -- the [1] 87/10 website [1] 25/17 Webull [5] 47/8 47/11 47/16 47/18 63/6 **Wednesday** [1] 12/2 week [2] 81/14 84/25 weeks [12] 13/25 20/24 29/14 43/18 48/14 64/1 69/5 71/9 81/13 83/7 84/25 93/4 weigh [4] 28/20 53/1 81/1 84/9

Docum**vicies** 1 F95/d on 04/16/24 in well [40] 5/23 7/3 10/4 18/24 24/4 25/6 29/22 37/8 38/20 40/3 42/25 49/19 53/11 55/22 56/9 56/16 56/17 56/23 57/22 58/5 58/12 59/5 62/5 62/16 63/3 63/19 64/23 64/24 69/2 70/11 73/8 73/25 74/6 74/19 85/2 85/14 87/23 88/10 88/19 91/24 went [8] 11/5 41/12 52/16 57/8 70/15 71/18 83/6 88/3 were [44] 5/5 6/14 6/16 6/17 7/17 17/21 18/15 22/24 23/5 26/11 27/7 28/2 28/9 37/15 41/21 41/22 43/18 44/6 44/6 44/15 45/6 46/2 49/4 50/11 50/19 52/21 54/13 56/4 60/6 60/6 63/13 63/16 73/20 73/22 76/12 88/3 88/7 88/12 89/4 89/5 89/13 89/23 89/25 90/14 were -- we [1] 63/16 weren't [4] 6/15 52/21 65/21 89/24 west [1] 69/18 Whac [1] 10/2 what -- when [1] 28/9 **what's [8]** 8/19 8/19 30/17 45/8 54/11 55/1 63/10 70/7 whatever [3] 41/15 61/16 88/11 whereby [1] 41/10 wherein [1] 18/21 whether [8] 23/14 45/8 58/25 61/3 64/15 73/17 76/5 77/10 which [52] 4/8 4/14 5/4 20/6 20/10 21/24 22/7 22/8 22/20 23/21 23/25 25/10 26/25 27/7 29/19 30/11 31/1 33/14 35/6 35/7 40/9 40/18 40/19 41/2 41/7 41/21 43/8

r44/4 45/3047/19 51/193 52/4 56/14 66/18 67/6 67/9 67/16 67/17 68/7 68/17 70/17 71/18 72/22 72/22 73/4 73/9 76/2 76/13 85/4 86/20 87/12 88/15 while [6] 6/14 10/9 21/13 64/6 69/4 89/14 whistleblower [1] 71/23 Whitley [2] 51/14 87/11 who [26] 4/6 4/16 5/13 7/24 8/19 9/8 15/7 21/9 32/12 35/22 36/23 36/23 37/4 51/4 52/12 55/12 60/6 64/21 72/11 74/25 75/16 75/23 82/22 89/13 90/9 94/11 who -- you [1] 8/19 **who's [3]** 8/19 31/13 52/10 **Whoever** [1] 53/1 whole [1] 30/1 **wholesale** [1] 37/3 whom [2] 32/22 72/11 why [41] 6/18 6/20 6/21 7/1 7/2 7/16 8/9 9/13 10/8 10/10 12/1 17/22 19/14 19/17 22/22 22/22 24/25 33/3 39/8 40/6 48/23 50/25 51/8 54/4 54/9 54/21 55/4 63/19 66/22 70/2 70/19 71/10 73/13 73/14 73/20 73/23 74/21 76/22 85/4 92/15 96/3 **why -- and [1]** 6/18 wife [8] 50/23 51/18 81/15 88/4 88/10 88/17 89/6 89/14 wife's [1] 52/20 will [40] 9/9 9/19 10/24 14/22 14/24 16/20 16/21 16/21 16/21 17/6 17/18 19/6 24/18 27/4 27/4 30/9 32/4 32/13 32/14 33/1 34/9 34/24 35/20 36/19 41/5 43/10 63/10 63/11 63/11 63/22 64/4 66/6 66/15 67/16 79/15 82/20 85/4 93/9 93/20 93/22

WCase 4:22-cr-00612 will -- will [1] 27/4 **WILLIAM** [1] 2/5 WILLIAMS [4] 2/9 4/6 16/3 39/15 **Williams' [1]** 10/12 win [1] 13/16 wind [1] 47/18 windows [1] 69/7 wise [1] 75/1 within [8] 13/7 13/25 16/7 17/15 21/6 28/1 43/18 62/19 without [3] 16/24 48/15 48/16 witness [19] 21/9 52/11 52/12 53/16 60/20 66/5 66/14 66/19 69/13 71/15 77/15 82/22 83/12 95/1 95/6 95/10 95/14 96/3 96/4 witness's [1] 66/7 witnesses [9] 21/1 21/7 33/20 52/8 59/4 61/2 69/14 72/3 82/17 won't [2] 78/21 79/18 word [4] 33/17 59/11 70/18 71/17 work [12] 13/9 18/6 18/12 24/22 24/25 27/25 35/15 60/5 79/1 85/3 93/1 93/3 working [6] 12/1 15/16 25/6 25/6 27/10 32/18 works [1] 60/8 world [1] 72/15 worried [1] 79/25 worry [2] 82/24 93/1 worth [7] 11/3 54/6 65/23 71/2 71/3 93/5 93/15 **would [75]** 5/11 5/11 7/6 7/20 8/12 8/13 8/13 10/11 10/18 13/7 13/20 19/12 21/14 23/6 27/20 28/11 29/8 29/15 30/6 31/7 31/16 33/20 35/16 37/19 37/19 38/23 44/7 45/23 45/23 49/4 50/2

60/25 61/9 62/8 63/14 63/21 | you -- you [1] 7/3 65/25 67/11 69/4 70/10 70/10 70/19 70/20 70/22 70/23 70/23 71/16 71/17 71/19 71/21 71/23 71/25 72/12 72/15 72/25 73/2 73/5 74/21 75/8 75/21 76/15 79/3 81/17 82/4 85/11 90/24 91/7 92/15 94/9 95/15 96/11 **would -- I [1]** 45/23 wouldn't [1] 90/20 write [2] 34/16 90/21 writing [1] 62/10 wrong [5] 6/7 11/13 12/1 47/24 56/24 wrote [2] 67/17 67/18

v'all [16] 62/5 69/9 69/22 70/5 70/22 77/23 78/24 78/25 79/2 79/4 79/22 80/14 86/7 91/19 93/2 96/16 yeah [14] 9/19 53/8 63/3 67/19 68/2 68/3 71/8 75/7 84/13 84/19 85/24 89/10 89/18 94/18 year [7] 18/7 27/13 35/7 48/8 65/15 65/24 84/15 years [7] 14/25 16/7 44/24 62/22 75/20 81/11 81/11 years -- almost [1] 81/11 years' [1] 65/23 Yep [1] 88/23 **Yes** [10] 5/19 17/9 49/3 52/23 60/1 92/10 92/18 94/23 95/21 95/24 vesterday [3] 25/10 33/19 35/13 yet [4] 14/14 31/5 34/14 67/3 York [3] 1/13 1/24 1/24 **you [288] you -- also [1]** 25/22 **you -- but [1]** 62/2

Document 6936/F36862 b 49/6/24 in two -- that d 1337/333 you'll [4] 25/9 48/25 79/13 93/13 **you'll -- I [1]** 25/9 you're [26] 6/6 8/7 8/7 8/23 8/24 9/3 9/5 10/9 18/17 56/3 56/12 56/24 56/25 57/3 57/4 58/7 58/12 58/17 61/11 74/8 74/21 85/17 89/12 89/17 92/6 94/25 **vou've** [8] 26/13 29/2 29/5 57/15 57/23 67/13 85/18 93/16 young [1] 17/2 youngest [1] 81/13 your [136] **your -- what [1]** 91/12 Your Honor [104] **Your Honor's [3]** 65/6 84/15 85/24

Z

ZACHARY [2] 2/19 24/16 **Zack** [1] 54/5 **ZADEH [3]** 3/5 3/6 94/12 zero [1] 26/10